DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 080 UD 010 343

TITLE	Urban School Crisis: The Problem and Solutions Proposed by the HEW Urban Education Task Force.
PUB DATE	5 Jan 70
NOTE	65p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National School Public Relations Association, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Stock No. 411-12756, $4.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Legislation, Educational Needs, Federal Programs, Financial Needs, *Financial Problems, Program Evaluation, Student Characteristics, *Urban Education, Urban Environment, Urban Population, *Urban Schools, Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Urban Education Task Force

ABSTRACT

This report, compiled by the Urban Education Task Force (under the Department of Health Education and Welfare), offers both a comprehensive analysis of the crisis in urban education and recommendations for the future. Chapters cover: the financial crisis of the urban schools, urban education as a system, the impoverished urban student, and the problems in evaluating the impact of current Federal compensatory education programs. An Urban Education Act is proposed along with guidelines for curriculum, authority structure, funding process, and an assessment of cost. Short term recommendations to stay the deterioration of the urban schools are suggested. Appended are: the history and organization of the task force, references, and the dissenting views of one of the task force members. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (KG)

N-NEA
HD

ED041080

Urban School Crisis

The Problem and Solutions

Proposed by the HEW Urban Education Task Force

UD010343E

Final Report of the Task Force
on Urban Education
of the Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare

Submitted to HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch

January 5, 1970

Washington
Monitoring Service
by the Editors of
Education U.S.A.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Preface

Most observers agree that this report by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Urban Education Task Force is the most comprehensive ever conducted on city schools and their problems. It is the "definitive work" on the subject, one informed observer commented. Yet, despite intense interest, HEW has no plans to make the report available for general distribution.

The Task Force's report came to light for the first time in the January 19 and January 20 editions of the *Congressional Record*. It was placed there by Rep. Jeffery Cohelan (D-Calif.), who had been given a "leaked" copy. But since the *Record's* circulation is limited, the report remained unknown to most educators. In view of the great interest, the editors of EDUCATION U.S.A. decided to reprint the report as a public service. Unfortunately, because of production limitations, it is necessary to reproduce the small type used by the *Congressional Record*. But we believe the most important thing is to give the education community the benefit of the Task Force's wisdom—and many months of effort.

All school districts in cities of 50,000 or more and all districts in metropolitan areas, no matter what their size, can gain new insights to their problems and find possible solutions in the careful analysis and recommendations of the study. Even educators in rural districts will find value in the report, especially in the areas of compensatory education and community involvement.

Formed at the direction of HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch in March 1969, the Task Force went to work to assist Finch in HEW's long-range planning, budgeting, and legislative efforts. Its work immediately took on special importance because of the high priority assigned to the urban education crisis by U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen. The Commissioner wanted some solutions and the Task Force was asked to recommend specific actions the Administration could take to ease or solve some of the more severe problems. The recommendations are in the Task Force report. But not all Task Force members agreed. The principal dissenter was Francis D. Murnaghan Jr., former president of the Baltimore Board of School Commissioners. A summary of his dissent is added at the end of the report.

Despite Murnaghan's dissent, most observers believe the Task Force has produced a classic document for American education. The nation has been given a blueprint of the extraordinary deficiencies in our urban school system and a clear guide to follow in correcting these deficiencies.

The Editors, EDUCATION U.S.A.

Table of Contents

Membership of the Urban Education Task Force 4

Complete Report of President's Task Force on Urban Education

Chapter I: Introduction: Perspective for the Report 5

II: The Financial Crisis of the Urban Schools 8

III: The Urban Environment of the Students 21

IV: The Urban Education System 31

V: The Impoverished Urban Student 39

VI: Problems in Evaluating the Impact of Current Federal Programs for Impoverished Populations 41

VII: The Federal Role in Urban Education: Limits and Obligations 43

VIII: An Urban Education Act—The Education Program 45

IX: An Urban Education Act—The Authority Structure 50

X: An Urban Education Act—The Funding Process 55

XI: An Urban Education Act—The Cost 57

XII: Short Term Recommendations for Urban Education 59

Urban Education Task Force: History and Organization 61

Note on Methodology for Chapter II 62

References 62

The Dissent of Francis D. Murnaghan Jr. 64

Membership of the Urban Education Task Force Of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Chairman: Wilson C. Riles, Director, Division of Compensatory Education, State of California.

Cochairman: John F. Hughes, Director, Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education.

COMMITTEE

I. Organization and Authority; Parent-Community Involvement: Chairman, Mr. David Seeley, Director, Public Education Association, New York, New York; Cochairman, Mrs. Elinor Wolf, Coordinator for Citizen Participation, U.S. Office of Education.

II. Education Program Components; National Assessment: Chairman, Mrs. Josie Bain, Area Superintendent, Los Angeles Public Schools; Cochairman, Dr. Anne O. Hughes, Education Program Specialist, U.S. Office of Education.

III. Financial Resources, Governmental Relations: Chairman, Mr. James A. Kelly, Executive Associate, National Urban Coalition, Washington, D.C.; Cochairman, Jerome T. Murphy, Formerly Associate Director, National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C.

IV. Racial and Ethnic Isolation, Facilities, Metropolitan Planning: Chairman, Mr. Harland Randolph, Vice President for Planning and Development, Federal City College, Washington, D.C.; Cochairman, Mr. Oscar Mims, Chief Education Advisor, Model Cities Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

V. Educational Alternatives: Chairman, Mrs. Gwyn Jones-Davis, The Way School, Minneapolis; Cochairman, Mr. Richard Carlson, Budget Examiner, Bureau of the Budget.

MEMBERS OF THE URBAN EDUCATION TASK FORCE

Milton E. Akers, Executive Director, National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Robert Aptekar, Assistant Director, Program Development Division, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

Edward A. Bantel, Professor of Education and Psychology, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.

Thomas J. Burns, Assistant to the Deputy, Office of the Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Education.

Alan K. Campbell, Dean, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

John Cantwell, Program Coordinator, Bureau of Research, Division of Educational Laboratories, Office of Education.

John Cheston, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Evaluation, Department of Labor.

John Cicco, Deputy Superintendent, Diocese of Pittsburgh, Pittsburg., Pennsylvania.

Ronald Cox, Staff Assistant to the State Senate, State Capitol, Sacramento, California.

George Dawson, Special Assistant to the Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education.

Robert A. Dentler, Director, Center for Urban Education, New York, New York.

Alva R. Dittrick, Executive Vice President, Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement, Washington, D.C.

Anthony Downs, Senior Vice President, Real Estate Research Corporation, Chicago, Illinois.

Norman Drachler, Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

Bessie Draper, Parent Program Specialist, Office of Economic Opportunity—Head Start, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chester Finn, Staff Assistant, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Dorothy Gilford, Assistant Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Education.

Herman R. Goldberg, Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education, Rochester, New York.

Martin Gula, Specialist on Group Care, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Samuel Halperin, Director, Educational Staff Seminar, Washington, D.C.

Kenneth Haskins, Principal, Morgan Community School, Washington, D.C.

Richard Hays, Program Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Ermon O. Hogan, Education Specialist, National Urban League, Inc., New York, New York.

H. T. James, Dean, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Christopher S. Jencks, Co-Director, Cambridge Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

George W. Jones, Director, Task Force on Urban Education, NEA, Washington, D.C.

Bernard Kaplan, Director, Office of Planning, State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey.

Otto P. Legg, Senior Program Officer, Program, Planning and Evaluation Staff, Division of Vocational Education, Office of Education.

John P. Mallan, Senior Staff Member, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Carl L. Marburger, Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey.

James Mauch, Director, Office of Research and Field Services, University of Pittsburgh, School of Education, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Richard McCann, Division of Educational Laboratories, Bureau of Research, Office of Education.

Francis Murnaghan, President, Baltimore School Board, Baltimore, Maryland.

Joseph C. Paige, Director, Urban Adult Education Institute, Detroit, Michigan.

Suzanne Price, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Education.

Malcolm Provus, Director of Research, Board of Public Education, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Irving Ratchick, Coordinator of Title I, ESEA, State Education Department, Albany, New York.

J. William Rioux, President, Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit, Michigan.

Armando Rodriguez, Mexican-American Affairs Unit, Office of Education.

Michael Russo, Chief, Planning and Evaluation, Division of Vocational Education, U.S. Office of Education.

Flora B. Seefeldt, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

David Selden, President, American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.

Charles H. Smith, Associate Director, Rockefeller Foundation, New York, New York.

Howard Vincent, Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, Office of Education.

Carol T. Hobson, Chief, Elementary-Secondary Survey Branch, National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education.

Bernard C. Watson, Deputy Superintendent, Philadelphia Public Schools, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Patricia Worlock, Special Assistant for Program Development, New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Trenton, New Jersey.

STAFF

Barbara H. Desind, Education Program Specialist, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Compensatory Education.

Stephen E. Herbits, Formerly Consultant on Research Activities, Campaign Systems, Inc., Washington, D.C.

John J. McGarraghy, Formerly Education Program Specialist, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Compensatory Education.

Sheila Platoff, Education Program Assistant, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Compensatory Education.

Corinne Slattery, Education Program Assistant, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Compensatory Education.

Chapter I. Introduction

Perspective for the Report

Three points should be borne in mind with regard to the Urban Education Task Force Report. One is that the problems confronting urban education and its environment are *not* of sudden origin. Such problems as inadequate financing, increased enrollments, insufficient staffing, and discrimination in housing and jobs have *all* existed for a considerable period of time. However, there are some differences. One consists of the surfacing of these problems at the national level. Another is the increased awareness of both their gravity and complexities. Outstanding among them are: the steadily dwindling financial resources of education; the persistence of racism; the rising expectations of impoverished urban residents; and the interrelatedness of *all* the problems to poverty.

The second point concerns the picture we present of urban education and its environment. By and large, it is far from pleasant. However, the presentation in the documentation section is not to be construed as criticism for criticism's sake. Rather, our intent is to underscore the urgency of urban education's needs and to lay the foundation for our ensuing recommendations. To make constructive recommendations for urban education's improvement—and the inner city and suburban poverty pockets in particular, it is necessary to examine its current state of affairs.

The third point concerns the viewpoints of the Task Force members themselves. Every member of the Task Force fully recognizes that education in this country has never been assigned an adequate priority in terms of financial, human, and material resources. Moreover, every member has a deep commitment to improving the quality of American education. However, difference arose among members as to the best ways and means for achieving this improvement. It was inevitable that the Task Force, deliberately chosen to reflect diversity in viewpoints, would find unanimity impossible on all of the recommendations made by its committees. Hence, both majority and minority points of view are presented in the Report with the intent of demonstrating alternative recommendations for resolving the issues and problems which are identified. One formal minority report was filed by Mr. Francis P. Murnaghan, Jr., President, Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore Public Schools. This report was circulated to all Task Force members asking for their comments on it as well as for their comments on the draft majority report. This final revision of the Task Force Report reflects a conscientious and systematic effort to incorporate the suggestions for modifications made by Task Force members and to present the views and recommendations expressed in the formal minority report as an alternative to those of the majority report.

This Report is therefore focused both on documenting the needs of urban education and on presenting recommendations to meet them—both those of the majority and of the minority.

Overview of the Urban Education Problem

Urban education systems are facing a major challenge to provide appropriate learning experiences for the various life styles of their vast numbers of students. The indicators of this challenge are extremely diverse in their intensity and scope: student unrest on university campuses and in the high schools, local community groups seeking control of their neighborhood schools, clashes with law enforcement agencies, complaints being filled with regard to use of Federal funds, teacher strikes, voter rejection of large city school bond issues, the proliferation of alternative plans for educating students, lack of priority for education in State and local governments. By far, the greatest number of such indicators—interacting on and intensifying each other—are taking place in our cities.

This challenge is, in turn, part of yet a broader and more complex one. A major change has occurred in the perceptions of large numbers of American citizens, specifically, the minority racial and ethnic groups. They are convinced that they have been short-changed by their fellow American citizens—the white majority—who largely control the social, economic, political, and educational instiutions of our nation. The steady accumulation of evidence across a wide spectrum of human needs and rights signals that this perception is largely supported. It is within this context of challenge that urban education must be reconceived, revitalized, and adequately financed.

Simplistic and partial solutions which have been and may still be offered to resolve complex educational problems of increasing magnitudes are untenable. To accomplish this task, vastly increased amounts of money are imperative. In general, the amount of Federal money thus far added has been insufficient for the magnitude of the task confronted. Furthermore, the sustained flow of money is another problem. Specifically, this porblem consists of assuring the continuing supply of money.

Systems are faced with fluctuations in levels of Federal, State, and local appropriations and budgets for special programs; failures in passage of local school bond issues; reductions in assessed property values and the other taxing bases within the cities. Complicating the issue are contradictions in terms of legislation and budget priorities at Federal, State, and local levels which all too often work against the urban areas—and their educational systems. As if these problems were not enough, the cost of providing educational services and programs in large urban areas is increasing every year. Thus, as the cities become poorer and education becomes costlier, the probabilities inevitably increase for the inner city student to participate in only a substandard education. And it is he who should be able to secure a superior education since it constitutes his passport to economic self-sufficiency and self-realization.

However, solving the monetary problems alone is not the complete answer. There must be changes in the educational system as well. Here and there, appropriate—and, therefore, effective—compensatory education programs are flourishing with evidence of increased learning by impoverished children. Such programs usually reflect a *combination* of modified curriculum, enlightened staff attitudes, and adequate funding. But all too often, special programs to meet special needs have turned out to be "more of the same" programs. Offered such programs, the students involved have wastefully and tragically proved again and again that these programs do not—and cannot—meet *their* needs. No urban educational system has yet succeeded in meeting the educational needs of all of its poor children.

Pilot or demonstration projects have typically lacked the magnitude to provide adequate answers. In such efforts, a usually small-scale intensive program is mounted which presumably takes the students' special needs—*and assets*—into consideration. Assuming that the program is appropriate and the staff is adequately trained, the problems are often the involvement of too few students, prohibitive costs per student, and experimental and instructional techniques which are not readily transferable to large-scale operations. Another problem is that such projects usually have key people in leadership positions whose personal styles of working are not easily replicated for the expanded operations.

While educational research has played a part in some of these projects, the general pattern has been to avoid the kind of research which deals with major learning problems. Researchers have usually singled out only limited aspects of such problems for largely financial or methodological reasons. First-rate comprehensive studies of inner city children and youth are rare phenomena indeed. Thus, research with its current conceptualization and methodology does not generally provide a clear sense of the broad directions to be taken.

Another problem has been that most of the programs have been conceived from a perspective which implicitly compares the inner city student from a minority group with his white middle class, age, and grade-level suburban counterpart. The results and applications of such comparisons are inevitably negative—the inner city student winds up being described as deficient in . . . verbal ability, reading achievement, marketable economic skills, and social skills.

The strengths or positive characteristics of this student are almost never considered e.g., his pride, his tough pragmatic problem-solving, his resiliency in the face of daily economic uncertainties, his personal loyalty to his group, his sense of humor, his candor—or lack of hypocrisy. Consequently, most of the programs are designed from a negative standpoint, namely, overcoming deficiencies, and are almost never designed from the positive view of capitalizing on strengths. Such programs, however, well-intentioned, often reflect the implicit assumption that the white middle class student is the standard or model. This assumption leads the educator and the community-at-large into perceiving the inner city sudent through a mediating stereotype instead of as an individual in his own right who may be thoroughly alienated by programs designed to remake him in an image which is neither his own nor necessarily appropriate for him to adopt. Rarely, have inner city community residents and students had the opportunity either to make significant decisions about the kinds of programs to be implemented or to make a significant contribution in their implementation. Yet, these residents and students have the most direct knowledge and experience of all.

Positions of the Task Force

The Administration has announced new and far-reaching plans in the areas of welfare and employment. There is no doubt whatsoever that these areas are critically in need of immediate assistance. However, we firmly believe that only through the educative process can *long term* effective solutions to welfare and employment finally be devised. Education holds the promise of a one-generation up and out of poverty process. That is, the poverty child of a welfare mother, of an underemployed father, or of a seasonally underemployed parent does *not* have to repeat the poverty cycle of his parents if he receives his passport out. That passport is valid and salable education.

It is within this context that we strongly urge that the problem of urban areas should be considered as the major priority of the Administration's domestic program in the 1970's. Within this priority, education—broadly conceived and with new constituencies involved—should become a first consideration. Human talent—regardless of color, environment, social level or anything else—is our most valuable national resource. The education process—appropriately designed and directed—is our most potent means for developing the rich diversity of all of this talent.

Our major thrust is, therefore, a long-term one involving planning and implementation of comprehensive urban education programs with a combined focus on the students' real needs and effective institutional change. However, we further recognize that there is an urgent and immediate NOW with which we must be concerned. Hence, we have developed short-term or interim plans and recommendations for urban education which provide for some immediate steps to be taken. The overwhelming majority adopted all of the below-noted positions.

Money

1. Significantly increased levels of funding are needed for urban education far exceeding what current appropriations—even atuhorizations—now make possible. ***Money is a major requirement.*** However, the criteria for securing funds for urban education programs must be based upon such factors as poverty indices, community determination, demonstrated capability to carry out such a program, levels of State and local efforts, the recognition of the fact that education is more expensive in the cities than elsewhere, and a clear focus on *both* the inner city areas and the suburban poverty pockets. The amounts that will ultimately be required to resolve the urban education problem, should we either continue at the level of our present efforts or only engage in tokenism will be literally "out of sight." Taking major action now is the economy of foresight; postponement can only demand the excessive price of hindsight.

Concept of Urban Education

2. Education as we have typically defined it is too narrow for the impoverished constituencies with whom we are concerned. The educative process must be truly expanded in its focus to the whole individual at all educational levels . . . as he is . . . as he can be . . . as he wants to be. Accordingly, his health, his emotional well-being, his intellectual capacities, his future employment, his self-realization are all involved and there must be adequate provisions made for these key aspects in this process.

Additionally, the educative process must no longer be conceived as only that which occurs within the physical boundaries of the school building as a result of formally planned lessons by the teaching staff. Instead, this process must be conceived of as taking place anytime and anywhere.

The learning which is acquired outside the school is just as valuable as that learning which is acquired within it. Moreover, this type of "outside" learning is definitely highly personal, meaningful, and direct ways which the "in-class" learning activities should not only be related to but could well seek to emulate. With regard to curriculum, the usual academic areas (e.g., reading and mathematics) must be appropriately reconceived and implemented. New areas must be included and interwoven with the other which are of special significance for the urban student, such as problems of narcotics additions, noise, overcrowding, and maintenance of individuality. Above all, the educative process should be focused on including the whole community with genuine sensitivity to and respect for its various needs, aspirations, and strengths.

Master Plan for Urban Education

3. The only viable approach to resolving the complex problems of education in urban areas is through the development and implementation of a master plan for urban education tailored to the specific needs of a particular urban area. Such a plan must concomitantly deal with causes and symptoms, must be conceived within a framework of over-all urban problem-solving rather than education per se, and must encompass all educational levels, i.e., from early childhood through higher and adult education. Moreover, this plan must reflect a considerable expansion and enrichment of what constitutes "education." Within the educational plan, there must be stress placed on developing and implementing appropriate curricular designs, consumer participation, staff development programs for *all* concerned, supportive services, and evaluation. Finally, it must be interrelated with other facets of the larger urban problems, such as housing, employment, recreation, and health. We recognize that the development and implementation of a master plan for urban education will not take place over night; it will take time, work, and the changing of attitudes.

Institutional Changes

4. There must be a deliberate sequence of steps planned and implemented which will lead to institutional change within educational systems. Such a sequence should be based on a changed and expanded perspective concerning the role(s) and function(s) of their schools and their staffing, including institutions of higher education. As Poga aptly stated, "I have met the enemy and he is us."

Among the areas of concern for such a sequence should be the: (1) involvement of the local neighborhood constituencies in the educative process and thus to work for common goals; (2) design and implementation of curriculum and the instructional programs which are highly appropriate to the perceived needs of these constituencies; (3) involvement of other social agencies in the educative process; and (4) education of the staff to perceive and teach the students as they themselves are and not as seen through the filters of mediating stereotypes—no matter how well-intentioned the program generated from such stereotypes may be. We believe that basically this change must come in the education system itself. Only the "educational establishment" is big enough to deal with the educational crisis on the grand scale. While we feel that alternatives (e.g., street academies, community-operated early childhood centers) to existing educational agencies should receive encouragement and financial support, the fundamental changes must be made within the system rather than occurring outside of it if education is to be a vital experience for the vast numbers of students to be served. Nevertheless, alternative educational approaches can also contribute positively to accelerating the rate of institutional change. Through the alternatives exerting pressure from *without* and the educational system working to revitalize itself from *within*, the key directions and techniques for implementing change can be identified.

Community Determination

5. The community residents and students who are to be the direct participants in urban education programs *must* have an active role in the critical decision-making concerning such programs. Whether this role should include full control by the community residents or a partnership arrangement with whatever educational agency is affected will be a matter which each urban area will need to work out on its own within a broad and flexible set of guidelines which will allow for various forms. Regardless of the particular form which community involvement takes, this role must include policymaking in the areas of: (1) priorities for spending the available monies; (2) design of curriculum and implementation of program components; and (3) employment and evaluation of key personnel.

Performance Standards

6. Clearly stated performance standards or criteria should be established for an urban education program. These criteria should constitute a clear statement of specific knowledges, attitudes, and skills which the students themselves are expected to demonstrate. In effect, they should describe the kinds of students the educative process intends to produce in terms of measurable overt behaviors.

Furthermore, performance criteria should be established for *all* educational staff involved in program (e.g., administrators, teachers, aides) based directly on the student-oriented objectives. As with the student objectives, these criteria should form the primary basis for evaluation of the educational staff. Finally, both the student and staff criteria should be stated in terms of overt, measurable behaviors.

Assessment

7. Assessment should be an integral part or component of the urban education program beginning with the planning phase. Moreover, this assessment component should be designed to assure rapid and continuing feedback on the program's strengths and weaknesses and should allow for rapid modifications and adjustments to be made in the program. Furthermore, the assessment component should be interwoven into all other components of the operating program and therefore would encompass much more than the measurement of the academic achievement areas, e.g., reading and mathematics. Federal funding should be conditioned on the attainment of measurable standards of performance by urban school agencies.

Racial and Ethnic Integration

8. Racial and ethnic integration should be a major element or recurring theme in *all* the planning and implementational phases of the urban education program and therefore should be clearly stated as a major criterion for receiving funds. Recognizing that there is no single or simple way of achieving real integration, a community applying for funds should demonstrate how its educational plan contributes to overcoming racial and ethnic isolation. We also believe that the current thrust composed of separatism, local community control of schools, and insistence on the recognition of minority identities (e.g., black history, La Raza) by various groups is the all-too-logical result of the basis lack of commitment and the slowness of action to achieve integration. The quality, recognition, and acceptance which were to have occurred with earlier thrusts on integration, such as equal employment opportunity, fair housing, and school desegregation, have not really materialized. We suggest that the composite thrust of separatism, local community control, and the demand for a recognized identity are not over the long term antithetical to the aims of integration. Rather, it constitutes an attempt to achieve through *other channels* what earlier thrusts have only partially fulfilled. In fact, as this current thrust is unfolding yet another thrust seems to be emerging. Some of its characteristics can be pointed out.

Specifically, it reflects neither the primary reliance of the minorities on public-spirited members of the white majority to do something for them nor the "we'll go it along" stance of certain groups within the minorities. Instead, other groups within these minorities are actively seeking legitimate power bases or positions of strength from which they can negotiate as equals with the majority. In striving to achieve this negotiating capability, the minorities are developing a new thrust in the continuing struggle for genuine integration which could be termed *interdependency*. As emerging here, it is saying, "you need us every bit as much as we need you—so we better find ways to cooperate as equal partners in our mutual concerns. It is only by working together that we are going to solve our society's problems." This emergent—and newest—thrust seems to hold potentially the greatest promise for achieving genuine integration since it concomitantly recognizes common goals (e.g., economic self-sufficiency, a healthful environment, improved educational programs) and proposes to work cooperatively on the ways to achieve them.

Purposes and Organization

Having presented the general overview and specific positions of the Task Force, the purposes of the Report are, as follows:

1. To describe and document the critical problems and needs confronting urban education in terms of their uniqueness and complexity as a justification for their urgency.

2. To examine the extent to which the Federal government can and should extend solutions to the problems facing urban education.

3. To recommend long-term programmatic and legislative approaches needed to resolve the problems and needs identified, including the framework for the educational program, the authority structure, the funding process, and the cost of the program; and also to recommend the short-term actions that can be taken under existing legislation.

The organization of the Report parallels its purposes, and is accordingly divided into three major sections. They are: (1) State of Urban Education; (2) The Federal Responsibility; and (3) A Plan for Urban Education—An Urban Education Act. Within each section, there are chapters which deal with the key elements of each section; and, where appropriate, stating the majority and minority viewpoints.

PART I—THE STATE OF URBAN EDUCATION

Overview

In Part One of the Report, the State of Urban Education, we consider the four major dimensions of the problem confronting urban education and devote one chapter to each. Specifically, these chapters are concerned with: (1) the financial crisis of the urban schools; (2) the urban environment of the students; (3) the urban education system; and (4) the impoverished urban student. Within the time constraints which have been imposed, we have attempted to document the pressing needs of urban education and to describe the context in which the urban education system must function.

There are two points to be borne in mind with regard to the chapters of Part One. The first is that rarely—if ever—has there been an attempt to show the problems of urban education in the light of their surrounding context. All too often, education and its setting are treated as separate entities with separate problems. Such is not the case. The operating units of the educational system—the schools—are based in neighborhood settings. And the problems, values, and needs of the residents of the neighborhood are inevitably carried by its children into the school. Moreover, the school is the most visible or tangible public social agency in the neighborhood. Since the children and youth spend more time in the school than they do in any other social agency, the school—in one form or another—exerts a tremendous social force. Hence, the presentation in this part is attempting to focus on the context in which the urban education system must function as well as on the system itself.

The second point arising from the first is that it proved extremely difficult to secure data for the documentation of the urban education system's needs and its context in a comprehensive and systematic manner. In some cases, data were not available in the form needed; and, in others, they were fragmentary or lacking in comparability. Nevertheless, sufficient evidence has been arrayed which clearly delineates the major dimensions of the problem confronting urban education.

It must again be underscored that the presentation in these chapters—and particularly Chapter IV, "The Urban Education System"—is to document the increasing necessity for making urban education's needs a major national priority.

Chapter II. The financial crisis of the urban schools

The schools of our cities are again opening their doors to a vast number of students with increasingly more complex educational needs. These students hold fewer expectations of having those needs met than ever before. For many urban educational systems the first priority this year will be that of keeping their doors open beyond the months of March or April. There is simply not enough money. Our urban schools are in a state of financial crisis.

This chapter will demonstrate the extent and nature of the financial crisis facing urban education through an explanation of the set of unique factors affecting the cities today. Implicit in the discussion of each factor is the recommendation that the Federal Government must assume a policy of top priority for urban areas demonstrated by massive appropriations to meet the needs of educationally and economically deprived families. The factors to be discussed are summarized as follows:

1. *Financial deterioration due to population migration.*—The money now is insufficient to meet greater needs in the city. The evidence of the financial deterioration of the central city is ever deepening because of patterns of population migration detrimental to the city coffers. High tax producers—members of business and high-salaried populations—are moving to the suburbs and are being replaced by an ever-increasing number of high tax consumers—disadvantaged persons—who are concentrating in the central cities.

2. *The higher cost of urban education.*—Education in the cities simply costs more than education in the surburbs. Several factors are responsible for this. There are more disadvantaged students in the cities than in the suburbs. It is a costlier job to effectively educate students whose poverty and low levels of family education are obstacles to that education, as opposed to the children of more highly educated and motivated suburban families who have the funds provide compensatory education through tutoring where required. In addition, maintenance and security costs are higher and the need for maintenance is compounded by the higher vandalism rates in cities.

3. *Inequitable State aid formulas.*—State aid formulas not only fail to recognize the disproportionate educational expenses of the cities but also compound the problem by providing central cities with less state aid per capita than is made available to the outyling areas.

4. *Dwindling popular support and confidence in education.*—Locally raised revenue is the major share of most public school budgets in large cities. In a number of large cties, adverse votes on tax measures and bond referenda for capital outlay have recently occurred. While the suburbs have often been hard-pressed by such cutbacks, the squeeze has been felt particularly sharply in the cities where the higher costs of non-educational needs has used up a greater percentage of local revenue, leaving a smaller percentage of the budget for education in the city than in the suburbs.

5. *Financial difficulties of non-public schools.*—Just as public school systems have in recent years experienced higher costs and lower budgets, many parochial and other non-public schools have felt financial pressures. Raised tuitions have caused numbers of students to enroll in public schools, particularly in the inner city. In many cases, religious orders have had no recourse but to close some of their schools for lack of funds for operating expenses. In such cases public schools have suddenly been confronted with serving whole new school populations with no increase in budget and no new facilities to ease the unexpected increase.

6. *Minimal level and minimal effect of Federal funds.*—Federal funds provide the smallest share of the local educational dollar. Even since the passage of legislation such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides substantial educational aid to school areas serving the disadvantaged, the total public school expenditures borne by Federal aid has been less than 8 percent nationally. In fact, in the 1969 fiscal year, estimates show a slight decrease to 7.3 percent.[1] And, in addition, the cities suffer from distribution procedures of Federal aid which do not take into account their special needs, just as they suffer from suburban-oriented state aid.

The financial situation in the cities is bleak indeed.

Financial Deterioration Due to Population Migration

The most serious threat to local support for urban education stems from general trends in American metropolitanism, not from educational finance per se. The average metropolitan area is undergoing a process which is decentralizing population and employment from the central city to the outlying areas while at the same time concentrating growing numbers of economically disadvantaged persons within the central city itself.

1. Population changes that affect differential family incomes

It is estimated that between 1950 and 1960 central cities grew at a rate of only 1.5 percent while the suburban areas of the nation's metropolises mushroomed at a rate of 61.7 percent if annexations are disregarded. More recent estimates show a slowing of metropolitan growth, with cities growing at 1.0 percent and OCCs at 25.4 percent for the 1960–68 period.[2] Such suburban growth, moreover, was common among all sizes of metropolitan areas (See Table 1).

While a lack of growth in population of the central city may in itself have serious financial impact, suburban and commuter population growth imposes the greater costs on central cities. Suburbanization undermines the cities' revenue base and the daily inflow of commuters into the city poses costs that must be financed by the cities. Police and fire protection, health services, parking facilities, and other services must be provided by central cities to suburban residents who spend their days in city employment but who return in the evening—and more importantly—pay their taxes to outlying jurisdictions.

TABLE 1.—POPULATION GROWTH IN METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH AND WITHOUT CENTRAL CITY ANNEXATIONS, 1950–60

	Total change (percent)	Change without annexations (percent)
All SMA's:		
Central cities	+10.8	+1.5
Outside central cities	+48.5	+61.7
Total	+26.4	+26.4
SMSA's, population of:		
3,000,000 or more:		
Central cities	+1.0	+.6
Outside central cities	+71.3	+72.2
Total	+23.2	+23.2
1,000,000 to 3,000,000:		
Central cities	+5.6	−2.2
Outside central cities	+44.8	+52.7
Total	+25.0	+25.0
500,000 to 1,000,000:		
Central cities	+21.4	+4.8
Outside central cities	+57.4	+81.1
Total	+36.0	+36.0
250,000 to 500,000:		
Central cities	+16.2	+2.2
Outside central cities	+36.2	+51.9
Total	+25.6	+25.6
100,000 to 250,000:		
Central cities	+24.4	+4.6
Outside central cities	+27.6	+54.5
Total	+25.8	+25.8
Under 100,000:		
Central cities	+29.2	+8.6
Outside central cities	+10.9	+69.9
Total	+24.4	+24.4

[1] Recent data indicates a slowing in rates of growth for both central cities and suburbs as follows:

	1960–68 total change (percent)
Central cities	+1.0
Outside central cities	+25.4
Total	+12.9

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population. Pt. A: Number of Inhabitants. Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics Series, p. 20, No. 181, Apr. 21, 1969, Bureau of the Census. Table A.

Furthermore, the economic and ethnic composition of the population change has aggravated the fiscal situation of the central city. Racially, central cities have been increasing in the percentage of their population that is Negro, estimated in 1968 to be 20.4 percent of total central city population. Suburbs have shown declining proportions of

Negro population since 1900, with Negroes numbering approximately 4.7 percent of residents of OCC areas according to 1968 estimates.[3] The generally lower income and educational levels of non-white populations inevitably provide the cities with fewer tax dollars and higher educational costs. (Campbell, *Metropolitanism*, 1969, pp. 25–27).

Estimates of income levels for the year 1967 are that central city areas had a median family income of $7,813 while for the outlying area the figure was $9,367 (Census, P–23, No. 27, 2/7/69, p. 36). Another way of demonstrating this income differential is to compare the percentage of families under $4000 in both central city and outside central city areas and the percentage of families with incomes over $10,000 in both areas. A consistent pattern of central city disadvantage emerges.

Higher proportions of central city families have incomes under $4000 than do those in the suburbs (19 percent vs. 12 percent) in 1967; [4] lower proportions of central city families have incomes over $10,000 than do those in the suburbs (33 percent vs. 45 percent).[5] Differences in income between central city and suburb are accentuated in the larger SMSA's (See Table 2 for detail in 1959 census figures). A study, published by the Committee for Economic Development, found that twice the proportion of central city population lived in poverty (16.2 percent) than did those in suburbs (8.6 percent) in 1966 (See Table 3).

2. Economic change

Along with these population changes, there has been a continuing exodus of all types of employment from cities to suburbs. In a 1967 report of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, *The Metropolitan Enigma*, the cities were found to have been losing employment in manufacturing, wholesale, and retail sectors at about one-half of one percent per year, while suburban areas have been gaining such employment areas at a rate of two and a half percent a year.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT OF FAMILIES WITH INCOMES UNDER $3,000 AND OVER $10,000 BY SIZE OF STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA, 1959

Population of SMSA	Number of SMSA	Percent of families with incomes					
		Under $3,000			Over $10,000		
		Entire SMSA	Central city	Outside central city	Entire SMSA	Central city	Outside central city
United States average	212	15.1	17.6	12.5	18.8	16.5	21.2
Over 3,000,000	5	12.6	15.4	8.9	23.0	19.5	27.6
1,000,000 to 3,000,000	19	13.0	17.1	10.0	20.8	16.6	23.9
500,000 to 1,000,000	29	17.2	19.8	14.2	16.4	14.6	18.4
250,000 to 500,000	48	17.6	18.7	16.6	14.6	14.7	14.5
100,000 to 250,000	89	19.5	19.6	19.3	13.7	14.3	12.9
Less than 100,000	22	20.7	18.8	27.2	13.6	14.4	12.0

THE RATIO OF NUMBER OF FAMILIES WITH INCOMES OVER $10,000 TO THOSE FAMILIES UNDER $3,000 PER 100 FAMILIES, BY SMSA SIZE, 1959

Population of SMSA	Entire SMSA	Central city(CC)	Outside central city (OCC)	Difference in ratio (OCC–CC)
United States	124.2	93.9	169.4	75.5
Over 3 000,000	183.0	126.7	311.5	184.8
1,000,000 to 3,000,000	160.5	97.3	233.0	141.6
500,000 to 1,000,000	95.6	73.8	129.3	55.5
250,000 to 500,000	82.8	78.6	87.4	8.8
100,000 to 240,000	70.3	73.1	88.6	−6.5
Less than 100,000	67.0	76.3	44.0	−32.3

Note: Table from Alan K. Campbell and Seymour Sacks, Metropolitan America: Fiscal Patterns and Governmental Systems, New York Free Press, 1967, pp. 22, 23.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population, 1960. Selected area reports: Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Final report PC(3)–1D.

TABLE 3.—INCIDENCE OF POVERTY BY AREA, 1[illegible]

Area	Percentage of total population in that area in poverty	Number of poor persons in that area (in millions)
United States	15.4	29.7
Metropolitan areas	12.1	15.2
Central cities	16.2	9.5
Suburbs	8.6	5.7
Nonmetropolitan areas	21.4	14.6
Rural nonfarm	23.1	7.4
Farm	22.5	2.4
Urban	18.7	4.8

Source: Downs, Anthony. Who are the Urban Poor? New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1968, p. 14.

The disadvantageous position of the central city is similarly demonstrated by examining the changed location of retail activity. Between 1958 and 1963 the largest 37 SMSA areas showed an average increase for central city retail activity of 4.8 percent as compared to a 45.5 percent increase in retail activity for the outlying areas (See Table 4). The magnitude of the changes is indicated by the fact that in 1958, 27.1 percent of all retail transactions were in these large central cities and 17.7 percent in their outside areas. As a result of the differential growth rates, the central cities in 1963 carried out 24.1 percent of the retail sales and the suburbs 21.2 percent, almost eradicating the previous enormous balance in favor of the central cities. The greatest decreases in retailing occurred in the central business districts, crucially lowering the city tax base. And it was the rare large city central district which recorded anything above a nominal increase in retail activity. In most of them the decrease was greater than that of the city as a whole, and in all cases, even if it did record an increase, it was far less than the SMSA taken in its entirety (Sacks, 1970).

A similar discouraging pattern existed in relation to manufacturing activity. In the aggregate, manufacturing employment in the central cities declined 6.0 percent, while outside the central cities employment increased by 15.6 percent (See Table 5).

3. Tax base change

The various forces thus far noted have a common effect on the local property tax base. Not only has the income base of the central cities been depressed relative to the suburbs but, in addition, the city property tax base has generally grown at a much slower rate than has the property tax base of metropolitan areas as a whole, with the exception of a very limited number of peculiarly circumstanced cities as shown in Table 6. In sum, the increase in gross assessed valuation in the suburbs far outstrips that of central cities.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 4.—RETAIL SALES, INSIDE (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS, 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1958 AND 1963

Area	1958 (in millions)			1963 (in millions)			1963 as a percent of 1958	
	SMSA	CC	OCC	SMSA	CC	OCC	CC	OCC
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	$9,040	$4,413	$4,627	$12,149	$5,022	$7,127	113.8	154.0
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	953	410	503	1,300	547	753	133.4	149.7
San Diego, Calif	1,132	725	407	1,408	794	614	109.5	150.9
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	3,440	1,875	1,565	4,511	2,165	2,346	115.5	149.9
Denver, Colo	1,182	833	349	1,533	857	676	102.9	193.7
Washington, D.C	2,502	1,304	1,198	3,367	1,418	1,949	108.7	162.7
Miami, Fla	1,369	752	617	1,618	655	963	87.1	156.1
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	919	693	226	1,152	767	385	110.7	170.4
Atlanta, Ga	1,230	879	351	1,619	1,016	603	115.6	171.8
Chicago, Ill	8,398	5,486	2,912	9,889	5,630	4,259	102.6	146.3
Indianapolis, Ind	1,127	866	261	1,401	917	484	105.9	185.4
Louisville, Ky.-Ind	820	578	242	977	625	322	108.1	145.5
New Orleans, La	968	765	203	1,123	801	326	104.7	158.6
Baltimore, Md	1,956	1,396	560	2,266	1,317	949	94.3	169.5
Boston, Mass	3,443	1,341	2,102	3,973	1,240	2,733	92.4	130.0

TABLE 4.—RETAIL SALES, INSIDE (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS, 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1958 AND 1963—Continued

Area	1958 (in millions)			1963 (in millions)			1963 as a percent of 1958	
	SMSA	CC	OCC	SMSA	CC	OCC	CC	OCC
Detroit, Mich	$4,448	$2,274	$2,174	$5,393	$2,303	3,090	101.3	142.1
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1,871	1,373	498	2,194	1,350	844	98.3	169.5
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	1,486	890	596	1,683	1,066	617	119.8	103.5
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill	2,427	1,168	1,259	2,847	1,068	1,779	91.4	141.3
Newark, N.J	2,243	674	1,569	2,582	665	1,917	98.7	122.2
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	1,451	523	928	1,871	447	1,424	85.5	153.4
Buffalo, N.Y	1,521	794	727	1,675	671	1,004	84.5	138.1
New York, N.Y	13,582	9,898	3,684	15,646	10,493	5,153	106.0	139.9
Rochester, N.Y	913	551	362	1,138	602	536	109.3	148.1
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind	1,279	815	454	1,404	800	604	98.2	133.0
Cleveland, Ohio	1,909	1,413	496	2,331	1,278	1,053	90.4	212.3
Columbus, Ohio	915	734	181	1,145	790	355	107.6	196.1
Dayton, Ohio	792	479	313	994	471	523	98.3	167.1
Portland, Oreg.-Wash	903	689	214	1,279	752	527	109.1	246.3
Philadelphia, Pa.-New Jersey	4,943	2,528	2,415	5,737	2,490	3,247	98.5	134.5
Pittsburgh, Pa	2,638	990	1,648	2,878	980	1,898	99.0	115.2
Providence, R.I	903	503	400	1,100	554	546	110.1	136.5
Dallas, Tex	1,473	1,144	329	1,809	1,288	521	112.6	158.4
Houston, Tex	1,717	1,299	418	1,962	1,616	346	124.4	82.8
San Antonio, Tex	703	646	57	807	726	81	112.4	142.1
Seattle-Everett, Wash	1,444	1,036	408	1,748	1,110	638	107.1	156.4
Milwaukee, Wis	1,459	1,067	392	1,706	1,076	630	100.8	160.7
37 EMSA total	89,449	53,804	35,645	108,215	56,367	51,848	104.8	145.5

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "U.S. Census of Business, 1958," vol. II; and U.S. Census of Business, 1963," vol. II.

Table from Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System," vol. 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities, Washington, D.C. October 1967, A–31.

TABLE 5.—MANUFACTURING EMPLOYMENT, INSIDE (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC), 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1958 AND 1963

[Figures other than percentages are in thousands]

Area	1958			1963			1963 as a percent of 1958	
	SMSA	CC	OCC	SMSA	CC	OCC	OC	OCC
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	729.0	327.2	401.8	842.9	304.0	538.9	92.9	134.1
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	29.2	11.7	17.5	37.5	14.0	23.5	119.7	134.3
San Diego, Calif	71.4	56.8	14.6	60.3	48.7	11.6	85.7	79.5
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	190.3	58.4	131.9	196.1	51.7	144.4	88.5	109.5
Denver, Colo	53.7	37.9	15.8	69.5	36.1	33.4	95.3	211.4
Washington, D.C	34.7	21.3	13.4	50.1	22.1	28.0	103.8	209.0
Miami, Fla	36.9	19.4	17.5	43.2	19.2	24.0	99.0	137.1
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	32.2	23.7	8.5	36.7	23.8	12.9	100.4	151.8
Atlanta, Ga	83.5	49.6	33.9	95.7	52.4	43.3	105.6	127.7
Chicago, Ill	857.2	569.4	287.8	860.6	508.4	352.2	89.3	122.4
Indianapolis, Ind	5.6	70.1	35.5	115.8	70.2	45.6	100.1	128.5
Louisville, Ky.-Indiana	86.7	55.7	31.0	87.6	58.0	29.6	104.1	95.5
New Orleans, La	46.9	30.1	16.8	49.1	31.1	18.0	103.3	107.1
Baltimore, Md	197.8	113.4	84.4	190.5	103.9	86.6	91.6	102.6
Boston, Mass	301.0	90.2	210.8	293.4	82.5	210.9	91.5	100.0
Detroit, Mich	467.4	213.5	253.9	493.9	200.6	293.3	94.0	115.5
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	146.0	113.5	32.5	163.8	110.3	53.5	97.2	164.6
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	103.1	64.9	38.2	111.1	62.1	49.0	95.7	128.3
St. Louis, Mo.-Illinois	262.5	146.8	115.7	259.7	129.1	130.6	87.9	112.9
Newark, N.J	245.6	78.8	166.8	250.2	73.7	176.5	93.5	105.8
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	158.5	62.9	95.6	176.5	62.8	113.7	99.8	118.9
Buffalo, N.Y	173.9	68.0	105.9	162.9	57.0	105.9	83.8	100.0
New York, N.Y	1,184.0	998.6	185.4	1,147.2	927.4	219.8	92.9	118.6
Rochester, N.Y	116.7	96.5	20.2	121.3	97.3	24.0	100.8	118.8
Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana	156.5	76.4	80.1	153.9	76.6	77.3	100.3	96.5
Cleveland, Ohio	273.7	180.8	92.9	280.3	168.9	111.4	93.4	119.9
Columbus, Ohio	73.0	55.4	17.6	80.2	65.9	14.3	119.0	81.3
Dayton, Ohio	97.2	78.2	19.0	104.2	81.2	23.0	103.8	121.1
Portland, Oreg.-Washington	58.3	35.2	23.1	65.3	35.6	29.7	101.1	128.6
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J	536.9	298.5	238.4	535.8	264.9	270.9	88.7	113.6
Pittsburgh, Pa	305.7	99.3	206.4	272.2	81.7	190.5	82.3	92.3
Providence, R.I	567.2	62.6	64.6	165.9	65.0	60.9	103.8	94.3
Dallas, Tex	95.2	79.7	15.5	109.5	86.3	23.2	108.3	149.7
Houston, Tex	104.5	68.8	35.7	108.6	77.3	31.3	112.4	87.7
San Antonio, Tex	20.9	19.3	1.6	23.6	21.4	2.2	110.9	137.5
Seattle-Everett, Wash	114.9	86.5	28.4	121.6	84.1	37.5	97.2	132.0
Milwaukee, Wis	189.5	126.6	63.9	193.8	119.3	74.5	94.2	118.4
37 SMSA total	7,867.3	4,651.5	3,215.8	8,090.5	4,374.6	3,715.9	94.0	115.6

Source: 1963 Census of Manufacturing. Table from ACIR, "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System," vol. 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities, Washington, D.C., October 1967, A–31, p. 54.

TABLE 6.—ASSESSED VALUATIONS, SELECTED LARGE CITIES AND THEIR ENVIRONS, 1961 AND 1966

[Dollars in thousands]

City and county	Gross assessed value including State-assessed property			Locally assessed real property		
	Amount		Percent increase or decreases (—)	Amount		Percent increase or decrease (—)
	1966	1961		1966	1961	
Los Angeles (Los Angeles County)	$6,602,518	$5,133,469	28.6	$5,493,997	$3,842,755	43.0
Remainder of county	9,305,428	7,628,555	22.0	7,296,636	5,504,740	32.6
San Diego (San Diego County)	1,132,097	959,617	18.0	896,312	710,294	26.2
Remainder of county	963,864	769,006	25.3	755,154	592,281	27.5
San Francisco (city-county)	1,785,052	1,509,095	18.3	1,225,167	1,041,073	17.7
Alameda County	1,953,958	1,594,987	26.1	1,409,571	1,067,938	32.0
Denver (city-county)	1,190,546	1,132,313	5.1	894,913	805,252	11.1
Jefferson County	370,183	248,236	49.1	310,170	202,201	53.4
Washington, D.C	3,538,066	2,735,578	29.3	3,027,939	2,324,612	30.3
Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md. and Arlington County, Va	4,875,381	2,735,322	78.2	4,073,511	2,267,39	79.7

TABLE 6.—ASSESSED VALUATIONS, SELECTED LARGE CITIES AND THEIR ENVIRONS, 1961 AND 1966 —Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

City and county	Gross assessed value including State-assessed property			Locally assessed real property		
	Amount		Percent increase or decreases (−)	Amount		Percent increase or decrease (−)
	1966	1961		1966	1961	
Atlanta (De Kalb and Fulton Counties)	$2,206,439	$880,950	36.9	$667,286	$502,975	24.7
Remainder of counties	1,074,584	732,978	46.6	803,205	508,009	58.1
Chicago (Cook County)	11,253,002	10,456,136	7.2	8,426,107	8,065,128	4.5
Remainder of county	6,985,946	5,718,397	22.2	6,209,218	4,862,052	27.7
Indianapolis (Marion County)	964,833	885,657	8.9	633,656	556,208	13.9
Remainder of county	658,469	448,257	46.9	451,254	279,524	61.4
Louisville (Jefferson County)	2,099,577	678,654	209.4	1,596,739	488,016	227.2
Remainder of county	2,116,328	556,040	280.6	1,526,994	387,205	294.4
Baltimore City	2,902,421	2,787,318	4.1	2,060,059	1,976,041	4.3
Baltimore County	2,277,957	1,743,854	30.6	1,819,785	1,416,464	28.5
Boston (Suffolk County)	1,507,495	1,467,907	2.7	1,368,025	1,337,254	2.3
Remainder of County	207,577	147,789	40.5	196,302	137,392	42.9
Detroit (Wayne County)	4,991,122	4,778,022	4.5	−2,941	3,341,301	13.5
Remainder of county	4,208,820	2,750,705	53.0	−0,459	1,842,737	66.6
Minneapolis (Hennepin County)	403,518	(1)	(1)	325,008	318,574	2.0
Remainder of county	329,013	(1)	(1)	290,956	182,127	59.8
St. Paul (Ramsey County)	240,656	(1)	(1)	184,670	182,048	1.4
Remainder of county	98,417	(1)	(1)	82,948	57,948	43.1
Kansas City, Mo.[2] (Clay and Jackson Counties)	1,127,177	1,000,085	12.7	719,479	631,345	14.0
Remainder of counties	395,076	334,098	18.3	312,857	252,220	24.0
St. Louis City	1,796,987	1,669,461	7.6	1,297,009	1,226,740	5.7
St. Louis County	2,151,191	1,662,272	29.4	1,674,184	1,298,345	28.9
Newark (Essex County)	1,403,838	750,505	87.1	1,248,045	596,598	109.2
Remainder of county	3,164,647	1,208,872	161.8	3,046,296	1,091,317	179.1
New York City	33,283,403	28,036,640	18.7	31,886,954	26,948,094	18.3
Nassau and Westchester Counties	6,658,595	5,995,761	11.1	6,405,660	5,773,641	10.9
Buffalo (Erie County)	1,121,422	1,129,087	−0.7	1,075,723	1,086,733	−1.0
Remainder of county	1,000,611	906,819	10.3	966,174	876,391	10.2
Rochester (Monroe County)	718,258	727,049	−1.2	684,288	695,667	−1.6
Remainder of county	708,924	524,167	35.2	687,841	508,141	35.4
Cincinnati (Hamilton county)	1,630,813	1,605,985	1.5	1,086,580	1,078,093	0.8
Remainder of county	1,748,127	1,408,024	24.3	1,237,908	983,217	25.9
Cleveland (Cuyahoga County)	2,851,240	2,917,808	−2.3	1,685,817	1,774,596	−5.0
Remainder of county	3,327,474	2,736,223	21.6	2,577,276	2,117,539	21.7
Columbus (Franklin County)	1,497,959	1,219,387	22.8	1,014,636	832,441	21.9
Remainder of county	865,979	639,758	35.4	646,922	478,397	35.2
Portland, Oreg.,[3] (Multnomah County)	660,877	874,956	−24.5	477,461	624,230	−23.5
Remainder of county	251,379	273,026	−7.9	195,030	208,242	−6.3
Pittsburgh (Allegheny County)	1,228,615	1,201,638	2.2	1,228,615	1,201,638	2.2
Remainder of county	2,350,539	2,039,511	15.3	2,350,539	2,039,511	15.3
Seattle (King County)	959,032	799,981	19.9	714,807	590,413	41.1
Remainder of county	876,351	467,364	79.8	626,322	358,338	74.8
Milwaukee (Milwaukee County)	2,251,917	1,985,697	13.4	1,820,657	1,659,985	9.7
Remainder of county	1,176,825	956,656	23.0	962,528	805,192	19.5

[1] Not available.
[2] Excluding the minor portion of Kansas City, Mo. located in Platte County.
[3] Excluding the minor portion of Portland, Oreg., located in Clackamas County.
[4] Copy illegible.

Source: Bureau of the Census, "Taxable Property Values" (1962 Census of Governments, vol. II), and "Assessed Valuations for General Property Taxation" (1967 Census of Governments, preliminary report, February 1968, CG–P4).
Table from ACIR, Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System, vol. 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities, Washington, D.C. October 1967. A–O. p. 83.

This shift in the property tax base is further indicated by statistics showing the average household value in central city and subsurban areas of the 37 largest metropolitan areas. With the exception of some Southern and some Western metropolitan areas,, central city household values are significantly lower than those of their suburbs. Furthermore, this condition of lower average household valuation has persisted between 1961 and 1966, another indication that the tax base of the country's large cities is in a relatively static condition compared to that of the outlying areas which are continually attracting higher valued property to their jurisdictions (See Table 7).

Not only are residential values depressed in central cities, but total per capita market values of property are higher in suburban areas than in central cities. Again with the exception of some Southern and Western metropolitan areas, per capita property tax bases are higher in suburban than in central city areas. Thus, given the higher proportions of nonresidential property within the central city, there is clearcut indication that this decline in the nonresidential amount of property tax base is intensifying the fiscal disparity between central city and suburb (See Table 8).

TABLE 7.—AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD VALUE, CENTRAL CITY AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY, SELECTED LARGE SMSAS, 1961–66

	CC	1961 OCC	Ratio, OCC to CC		1966 CC	OCC
			1961	1966		
Northeast:						
Washington, D.C.	$18,900	$19,851	1.05	1.15	$22,300	$25,589
Baltimore, Md.	9,200	14,400	1.57	1.92	8,900	17,096
Boston, Mass.	13,200	(1)			14,900	(1)
Newark, N.J.	12,200	20,483	1.68	1.46	16,000	23,429
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J.	(1)	(1)		1.33	19,000	25,359
Buffalo, N.Y.	(1)	(1)		1.92	9,500	18,252
New York, N.Y.	20,200	20,711	1.03	1.14	21,700	24,811
Rochester, N.Y.	11,900	18,728	1.57	1.91	11,000	20,958
Philadelphia, Pa.	8,500	13,880	1.63	1.84	8,800	16,226
Pittsburgh, Pa.	13,200	13,772	1.04	1.09	11,600	12,673
Providence, R.I.	12,600	(1)			16,600	(1)
Midwest:						
Chicago, Ill.	18,000	19,693	1.09	1.10	17,300	18,965
Indianapolis, Ind.	11,900	16,289	1.37	1.55	10,400	16,134
Detroit, Mich.	11,400	(1)			10,600	(1)
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	14,107	17,683	1.25	1.07	15,807	16,930
Kansas City, Mo.	11,368	13,054	1.15	.75	12,169	9,128
St. Louis, Mo.	12,300	14,571	1.18	1.38	12,100	16,272
Cincinnati, Ohio	15,900	19,039	1.19	1.15	15,800	18,190
Cleveland, Ohio	14,500	23,124	1.59	1.61	14,800	23,785
Columbus, Ohio	13,900	18,446	1.33	1.28	15,100	19,276
Dayton, Ohio	(1)	(1)		1.25	13,300	16,578
Milwaukee, Wis.	14,700	(1)			15,900	(1)

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD VALUE, CENTRAL CITY AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY, SELECTED LARGE SMSAS, 1961–66—Continued

	CC	1961 OCC	Ratio, OCC to CC 1961	Ratio, OCC to CC 1966	1966 CC	1966 OCC
South:						
Miami, Fla	(1)	(1)		0.92	$17,500	$16,093
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	(1)	(1)			(1)	(1)
Atlanta, Ga	$15,000	$13,027	0.87	.79	15,761	12,478
Louisville, Ky	10,300	13,180	1.28	1.40	11,900	16,612
New Orleans, La	17,300	14,200	.82	.91	19,500	17,700
Dallas, Tex	(1)	(1)			(1)	(1)
Houston, Tex	(1)	(1)			(1)	(1)
San Antonio, Tex	8,900	17,305	1.94		(1)	(1)
West:						
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	20 435	20,665	1.01	.84	28,958	24,234
San Bernadino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	(1)	(1)			(1)	(1)
San Diego, Calif	(1)	(1)		.88	19,000	16,734
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	21,416	20,639	.96	.84	30,286	26,000
Denver, Colo	15,200	15,674	1.03	.96	16,200	15,523
Portland, Oreg	10,200	11,833	1.16	1.29	12,200	15,681
Seattle, Wash	15,200	15,585	1.03	.92	17,400	15,946

Source: 1962 Census of Governments, Taxable Property Values; 1967 Census of Governments, Taxable Property Values.

TABLE 8.—PER CAPITA MARKET VALUE OF PROPERTY, CENTRAL CITY AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY AREAS SELECTED LARGE SMSAS, 1966

	Central cities [1]	Outside central cities [1]	Percent	Central cities [2]	Outside central cities [2]	Percent
Northeast:						
Washington, D.C	$10,166	$8,627	0.85	$10,285	$8,627	0.84
Baltimore, Md	4,684	5,803	1.24	4,602	5,803	1.26
Boston, Mass	6,929	(3)	(3)	5,811	(3)	(3)
Newark, N.J	5,066	7,306	1.44	4,819	7,306	1.52
Paterson, N.J	4,877	8,219	1.69	4,994	8,219	1.65
Buffalo, N.Y	3,446	8,449	2.45	3,081	8,449	2.74
New York, N.Y	8,994	8,088	.90	8,043	8,088	1.01
Rochester, N.Y	5,726	8,457	1.48	5,971	8,457	1.42
Philadelphia, Pa	3,669	4,959	1.35	5,694	4,959	1.34
Pittsburgh, Pa	4,916	5,036	1.02	4,622	5,036	1.09
Providence, R.I	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Midwest:						
Chicago, Ill	8,776	9,292	1.06	7,789	9,292	1.19
Indianapolis, Ind	5,762	9,046	1.57	5,492	9,046	1.65
Detroit, Mich	6,260	(3)	(3)	6,459	(3)	(3)
Minneapolis - St. Paul, Minn.	9,088	7,368	.81	8,502	7,366	.87
Kansas City, Mo	10,313	6,262	.61	10,313	6,262	.61
St. Louis, Mo	7,172	7,528	1.05	6,332	7,528	1.19
Cincinnatti, Ohio	7,379	8,527	1.16	7,464	8,527	1.15
Cleveland, Ohio	10,047	10,167	1.01	9,453	10,167	1.08
Columbus, Ohio	6,832	10,970	1.61	6,888	10,970	1.59
Dayton, Ohio	9,507	7,316	.77	9,380	7,316	.78
Milwaukee, Wis	5,963	(3)	(3)	5 761	(3)	(3)
South:						
Miami, Fla	$5,746	$6,071	1.06	$6,727	$6,071	.90
Tampa-St. Pete., Fla	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Atlanta, Ga	7,482	4,145	.55	8,289	4,145	.50
Louisville, Ky	5,784	7,151	1.24	5,728	7,151	1.25
New Orleans, La	6,221	6,497	1.04	1,966	6,497	3.30
Dallas, Tex	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Houston, Tex	7,264	19,303	2.66	(3)	19,303	(3)
San Antonio, Tex	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
West:						
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	11,811	11,941	1.01	10,481	11,941	1.14
San Bernadino, Calif	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
San Diego, Calif	7,031	8,529	1.61	7,952	8,529	1.08
San Francisco-Oakland Calif	22,435	12,424	.55	20,790	20,290	.61
Denver, Colo	8,423	6,466	.77	8,311	6,466	.76
Portland, Oreg	7,852	7,733	.98	8,195	7,733	.94
Seattle, Wash	14,685	8,899	.61	14,058	8,899	.63

[1] Based on residential assessment ratios in central cities-outside central cities.
[2] Based on total assessment ratios in central cities, residential assessment ratios in outside central cities. Source: 1967 Census of Governments, Taxable Property Values, tables 19 and 20.
[3] Not available.

The implications for educational expenditures of changes in the urban tax base are direct and important. Eighty-four percent of locally raised educational funds and 98 percent of tax revenues in fiscally independent school districts are raised through taxation.[8] It is significant to note that between 1930 and 1960, per pupil education costs across the country rose at a rate more than three times as fast as the average per capita value of taxable property in large cities (See Table 9).

4. General service needs

Accompanying these financial problems related to the changing population, commerical, and tax base factors, is the additional strain on city revenues caused by its high public service expenditure needs. Density and deterioration, poverty and the central business district are all factors which require a high service level relative to suburban and rural jurisdictions. Table 10 shows the startling picture. In the 37 largest SMSA's, central cities spent 175 percent of suburban expenditures per capita for non-educational local governmental purposes in fiscal 1965. Relating this to the ability to finance education, the 37 largest SMSA's central cities were able to devote only 30 percent of their total budgets to educational purposes, whereas the suburbs, with their much lower general municipal overburden were able to devote 53 percent of their local government expenditures to education (See Table 11).

The lower proportion of city expenditures devoted to education has often raised questions about the extent to which cities are trying to support education. Much of the question comes about because of the analyses which treat educational expenditures in isolation rather than seeing them as part of the total service and tax package which cities must bear. When educational expenditures are added to general government spending, the disparity between central cities and outlying regions is reduced because of the much greater proportion of spending which suburbs devote to schools, but cities still lead the way in per capita governmental costs. Table 12 shows the relationship, with cities spending in 1965 approximately 120 percent of suburban levels.

TABLE 9.—*Percentage changes in property values per capita in large cities and expenditures per pupil 1930 and 1960* [1]

Expenditures per pupil—	Percent
United States	331
Average for cities shown	97
Baltimore	92
Boston	15
Buffalo	37
Chicago	70
Cleveland	151
Detroit	152
Houston	201
Los Angeles	159
Milwaukee	82
New York	15
Philadelphia	6
Pittsburgh	25
San Francisco	117
St. Louis	167

[1] Full market values of property obtained by applying assessment ratios to assessed values; and the ratios for 1930 were obtained from Natioal Municipal Review (December, 1931), pp. 707–17, and ratios for 1960 were obtained by questionnaire from the school districts. Population data were drawn from U.S. Census reports.

Source: *Determinants of Educational Expenditures in Large Cities of the United States,* by H. Thomas James, James A. Kelly, and Walter Garms.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 10.—PER CAPITA NONEDUCATIONAL LOCAL GENERAL EXPENDITURE, CENTRAL CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS, 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1957 AND 1964–65

Area	1957			1964 to 1965		
	SMSA	CC	OCC	SMSA	CC	OCC
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	$159	$169	$110	$214	$257	$185
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	122	149	112	208	234	197
San Diego, Calif	110	120	99	191	196	184
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	135	158	118	240	269	222
Denver, Colo	111	141	73	135	195	84
Washington, D.C	127	189	47	202	373	114
Miami, Fla	118	156	98	157	201	138
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	85	111	43	147	201	71
Atlanta, Ga	79	103	48	166	227	114
Chicago, Ill	115	154	56	145	191	91
Indianapolis, Ind	91	116	32	107	121	68
Louisville, Ky.-Ind	75	100	43	90	123	61
New Orleans, La	108	117	81	152	151	154
Baltimore, Md	111	140	71	150	202	95
Boston, Mass	140	221	114	182	310	135
Detroit, Mich	112	140	86	155	184	133
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	114	130	92	185	216	144
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	87	123	56	118	134	105
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill	73	103	53	108	192	69
Newark, N.J	$112	$167	$93	$179	$299	$145
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	82	99	76	118	152	108
Buffalo, N.Y	125	141	111	186	219	166
New York, N.Y	175	193	119	284	330	172
Rochester, N.Y	130	147	104	195	234	160
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind	113	165	62	140	227	87
Cleveland, Ohio	119	133	108	164	188	145
Columbus, Ohio	99	114	62	137	150	94
Dayton, Ohio	78	120	51	124	187	91
Portland, Oreg.-Wash	88	128	51	119	166	83
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J	90	116	66	121	167	84
Pittsburgh, Pa	88	147	64	111	202	84
Providence, R.I	69	114	49	106	188	78
Dallas, Tex	91	119	44	116	133	90
Houston, Tex	84	91	61	113	124	76
San Antonio, Tex	59	65	17	76	(1)	(1)
Seattle-Everett, Wash	88	117	54	187	(1)	(1)
Milwaukee, Wis	157	178	121	220	237	187
Unweighted average	106	137	76	165	205	124
Weighted average	120	153	84	179	232	132

[1] Data not available.

Note: See app III for ACIR methodology concerning the problem of noncoterminality between school districts and other political jurisdictions.

Source: Compiled from various reports of the Governments Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census. Table from ACIR, Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System, vol. 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities, Washington, D.C. October 1967, A–31, p. 105.

TABLE 11.—EDUCATIONAL EXPENDITURE AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL GENERAL EXPENDITURES INSIDE (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC), 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1957 AND 1964–65

Area	1957		1964–65	
	CC	OCC	CC	OCC
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	36.7	45.8	34.1	47.6
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	49.7	41.7	47.5	46.5
San Diego, Calif	37.7	47.6	36.2	46.4
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	29.1	48.7	26.3	47.8
Denver, Colo	34.1	50.3	34.8	64.7
Washington, D.C	20.9	64.1	21.8	58.1
Miami, Fla	31.0	41.4	36.8	45.9
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	30.2	56.2	32.6	57.8
Atlanta, Ga	34.8	53.0	24.8	51.9
Chicago, Ill	23.8	60.6	28.7	59.9
Indianapolis, Ind	34.8	70.1	43.5	76.0
Louisville, Ky-Ind	38.3	62.3	43.6	62.6
New Orleans, La	28.2	32.5	28.8	33.9
Baltimore, Md	29.6	50.0	30.8	55.6
Boston, Mass	18.7	37.4	19.8	41.7
Detroit, Mich	30.1	57.0	34.3	53.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	29.7	51.1	23.0	57.5
Kansas City, Mo-Kans	33.9	49.1	33.0	57.3
St. Louis, Mo-Ill	30.9	57.3	29.9	60.8
Newark, N.J	31.3	48.6	27.6	48.2
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	36.1	51.6	37.7	52.2
Buffalo, N.Y	26.9	47.1	28.4	51.3
New York, N.Y	24.5	53.8	25.3	55.2
Rochester, N.Y	26.5	46.9	35.5	56.4
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky-Ind	32.9	47.0	42.1	47.9
Cleveland, Ohio	27.3	44.0	33.3	49.8
Columbia, Ohio	31.3	60.3	33.6	62.7
Dayton, Ohio	28.1	60.5	36.2	57.3
Portland, Oreg-Wash	36.9	61.1	42.8	62.9
Philadelphia, Pa-N.J	29.7	52.2	30.7	60.7
Pittsburgh, Pa	21.8	50.0	27.9	55.6
Providence, RI	37.9	60.0	39.2	59.9
Dallas, Tex	35.3	59.3	36.7	56.3
Houston, Tex	41.9	67.4	39.5	73.1
San Antonio, Tex	42.5	83.7	(1)	(1)
Seattle, Wash	32.8	61.3	35.2	35.5
Milwaukee, Wis	22.3	40.5	23.4	39.6
Unweighted average	31.0	51.3	32.6	53.2
Weighted average	(1)	(1)	29.9	52.5

[1] Data not available.

Note: See app. III.

Source: Compiled from various reports of the Governments Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census Table from ACIR, "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System," volume 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities, Washington, D.C., October 1967, A–31, p. 75.

5. Tax effort

But spending unrelated to tax base tells us nothing about the effort which communities are making to provide public services. Table 13 expresses this factor and in the aggregate demonstrates that city efforts in terms of per capita tax revenues as a percent of per capita income run considerably in advance of their suburbs. In aggregate terms, the cities tax themselves 33 percent more heavily than do the suburbs (see Table 14)

TABLE 12.—PER CAPITA TOTAL LOCAL GENERAL EXPENDITURE, CENTRAL CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS, 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1957 AND 1964–65

SMSA	1957			1964–65		
	SMSA	CC	OCC	SMSA	CC	OCC
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	$254	$267	$203	$368	$390	$353
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	221	296	192	391	446	368
San Diego, Calif	190	191	189	323	307	343
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	227	223	230	402	373	410
Denver, Colo	185	214	147	266	299	238
Washington, D.C	196	239	131	342	477	272
Miami, Fla	188	226	169	274	318	255
Tampa-St. Petersburg Fla	132	159	89	244	298	168
Atlanta, Ga	133	158	100	267	302	237
Chicago, Ill	178	202	142	249	268	227
Indianapolis, Ind	157	178	107	233	214	283
Louisville, Ky.-Ind	141	162	114	189	218	163
New Orleans, La	152	163	120	219	212	233
Baltimore, Md	175	199	142	254	292	214
Boston, Mass	203	273	181	279	427	239
Detroit, Mich	201	202	200	283	280	285
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	186	185	188	320	300	339
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	146	186	112	226	201	246
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill	134	149	124	207	274	176
Newark, N.J	$197	$243	$181	$309	$413	$280
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	156	155	157	230	244	226
Buffalo, N.Y	203	193	210	327	306	351
New York, N.Y	257	257	260	425	442	384
Rochester, N.Y	199	200	196	364	362	367
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind	181	246	117	252	392	167
Cleveland, Ohio	186	183	193	286	282	289
Columbus, Ohio	163	166	156	236	226	252
Dayton, Ohio	144	167	129	240	293	213
Portland, Oreg.-Wash	165	203	131	253	290	224
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J	151	165	138	226	241	214
Pittsburgh, Pa	147	188	128	211	280	189
Providence, R.I	118	160	99	188	255	163
Dallas, Tex	155	184	108	208	210	205
Houston, Tex	162	155	187	224	205	286
San Antonio, Tex	112	113	104	162	(1)	(1)
Seattle-Everett, Wash	159	174	142	325	270	335
Milwaukee, Wis	222	229	210	338	345	326
Unweighted average	175	198	156	277	304	265
Weighted average	193	214	171	303	332	278

[1] Data not available.

Note: CC as percent of OCC, 1957, 125 percent; 1965, 120 percent. (Averages computed for task force report.)

Source: Compiled from various reports of the Governments Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census Table from ACIR, "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System," vol. 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities, Washington, D.C. Oct. 1967, A–31, p. 103.

TABLE 13.—MEASURES OF TAX EFFORT IN CENTRAL CITIES AND SUBURBS IN 22 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (SMSA), 1962 [1]

[Per capita tax revenue, 1962, as percent of per capita income, 1960]

SMSA	Actual tax revenue		Adjusted tax revenue [2]		Adjusted tax revenue [3]	
	Cities	Suburbs	Cities	Suburbs	Cities	Suburbs
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
New York	9.5	7.5	7.8	7.0	7.3	6.8
Chicago	7.4	6.1	6.6	5.8	6.2	5.6
Los Angeles	8.4	7.0	7.3	6.0	6.8	5.6
Philadelphia	7.4	4.9	6.6	4.6	6.1	4.4
Detroit	7.5	5.7	6.2	4.9	5.5	4.6
Baltimore	6.9	4.4	6.0	4.3	5.3	3.9
Houston	5.9	5.6	5.4	5.4	4.7	4.9
Cleveland	7.4	5.2	6.1	4.4	5.5	4.2
St. Louis	7.6	5.1	5.9	4.8	5.2	4.4
Milwaukee	8.4	6.5	6.8	5.4	6.3	5.2
San Francisco	7.4	7.2	6.1	6.0	5.6	5.6
Boston	11.2	7.4	8.9	6.8	8.3	6.4
Dallas	5.7	3.7	5.2	3.1	4.8	2.7
Pittsburgh	7.2	4.9	6.8	4.7	6.3	4.5
San Diego	6.3	6.7	5.3	5.6	4.7	4.9
Seattle	5.0	3.6	4.5	3.2	4.2	2.9
Buffalo	7.5	7.0	6.2	6.2	5.7	5.9
Cincinnati	8.2	4.5	6.5	4.2	5.7	3.8
Atlanta	6.2	3.7	5.1	2.8	4.5	2.4
Minneapolis	7.0	6.5	5.3	5.6	4.8	5.3
Kansas City	6.0	5.4	5.1	5.0	4.5	4.6
Newark	12.3	7.0	9.5	6.5	8.9	6.2
Mean	7.6	5.7	6.3	5.1	5.8	4.8

[1] Data computed by and presented in: Woo Sik Kee. City-Suburban Differentials in Local Government Fiscal Effort. Morgantown: Regional Research Institute, West Virginia University, October 1967.

[2] Total tax revenue minus the estimated locally financed portion of expenditure for public welfare, health, and hospitals.

[3] Total tax revenue minus the estimated locally financed portion of expenditure for public welfare, health, hospitals, and education of children in families with incomes of less than $3,000.

Source: Reprinted in: Netzer, Dick. Impact of the Property Tax: Effect on Housing, Urban Land Use, Local Government Finance. Research Report No. 1. Prepared for the consideration of the National Commission on Urban Problems. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968. P. 52. Table from Financial Status of the Public Schools, Committee on Educational Finance, NEA, 1969.

TABLE 14.—PER CAPITA TOTAL LOCAL TAXES, CENTRAL CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS, 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1957 AND 1964–65

Area	1957			1964–65		
	Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Central city	Outside central city	Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Central city	Outside central city
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	$126	$155	$102	$207	$227	$194
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	98	141	81	188	203	181
San Diego, Calif	86	93	76	149	151	146
San Francisco-Oakland Calif	124	140	111	224	248	217
Denver, Colo	104	131	68	166	192	143
Washington D.C	124	185	75	184	291	129
Miami, Fla	107	132	94	143	169	131
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	66	78	47	111	131	84
Atlanta, Ga	68	98	44	107	128	89
Chicago, Ill	123	138	99	166	203	123
Indianapolis, Ind	97	106	68	158	155	168
Louisville, Ky.-Ind	78	92	59	97	113	79
New Orleans, La	56	62	38	71	84	47
Baltimore, Md	87	105	62	123	143	102
Boston, Mass	127	161	116	179	223	167
Detroit, Mich	111	127	95	154	171	141
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	98	115	75	162	172	152
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	85	105	69	132	135	131
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill	84	98	75	128	167	110
Newark, N.J	146	178	139	220	273	205
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	116	118	116	183	177	185
Buffalo, N.Y	114	116	112	176	170	179
New York, N.Y	164	167	153	262	279	221
Rochester, N.Y	121	122	119	181	179	180
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind	101	137	65	139	190	108
Cleveland, Ohio	103	106	98	161	151	169
Columbus, Ohio	78	80	72	120	113	138
Dayton, Ohio	81	126	52	138	180	116
Portland, Oreg.-Wash	99	135	66	149	189	119
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J	94	115	74	135	147	126
Pittsburgh, Pa	82	113	68	123	164	110
Providence, R.I	84	109	73	118	160	103
Dallas, Tex	78	101	43	105	122	77
Houston, Tex	84	85	70	118	114	132
San Antonio, Tex	51	54	26	63	(1)	(1)
Seattle-Everett, Wash	66	81	48	122	128	116
Milwaukee, Wis	118	126	104	167	193	122
Unweighted average	99	119	81	152	173	137
Weighted average	113	132	94	174	200	152

[1] Data not available.

Source: Compiled from various reports of the Governments Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

6. Summary

Dollars for government purposes are hard to come by in central cities because of (1) shifts in population and business activity, (2) deterioration of the property tax base, and (3) high service requirements. But educational dollars are hardest of all to find because general government (non-educational) service needs place such a heavy burden on city taxpayers.

The Higher Costs of Urban Education

Besides the general fiscal problems affecting cities, urban systems are also beset by higher costs for education than exist in outlying areas. It therefore takes proportionately higher city expenditures to purchase the same educational services than it does in the suburbs. Cities, however, are generally able to spend less per pupil than are their suburban areas and urban education accordingly suffers in comparison with the "better" schol systems in the environs.

1. *Disparities between city and suburban educational spending.*—Accurate current figures on the disparity between central city and OCC educational expenditures are, unfortunately, difficult to obtain. A recent cursory survey of several selected large city school systems and a satellite suburban system indicates through approximate per pupil expenditures, that the gap between a city and certain of its suburbs was a startling (see Table 15).[7] Far more money is being spent on the suburban child who generally enjoys the advantages of educational motivation, educated parents, resources to provide additional tutoring, etc. than on the inner city child whose educational needs are greater and whose extra school resources to meet them are fewer.

TABLE 15.—*Approximate per pupil expenditures for 1968–69*

New York City	$1,031
Scarsdale, N.Y	1,626
Los Angeles, Calif	636
Beverly Hills, Calif	1,131
Cleveland, Ohio	630
Shaker Heights, Ohio	968
Newark, N.J	637
Tenafly, N.J	922
Detroit, Mich	575
Grosse Point, Mich	875
Boston, Mass	655
Newton, Mass	842

Considerable analysis remains to be done before current fiscal reporting systems (which now tend to include a range of expenditures not formerly considered as educational programs) can be made comparable to studies of the pre-1966 period. Analysis underway at the Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation is designed to elicit such information, but it is our judgment that for the present the most reliable data may be found in statistics like those noted in Tables 16 and 17 and 18. Though they cover only the period through 1965, our preliminary research indicates that these patterns are probably continuing.

Table 16 shows the picture in 1962. At that time, the mean difference in total expenditures per student in 38 large SMSA's showed that OCC areas were outspending central city areas by nearly $150 per student. The same comparison for "current," as opposed to "total," expenditures per student showed a difference of more than $65 per student. In only two of these SMSA's in the case of total expenditures, and in only five in the case of current expenditures, did the central cities spend more per pupil than their outlying areas.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 16.—TOTAL AND CURRENT EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR CENTRAL CITIES (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS 1961–62

Cities	Total expenditures per student—(CC)	Total expenditures per student—(OCC)	Difference	Current expenditures per student—(CC)	Current expenditures per student—(OCC)	Difference
New York	$603.95	$869.32	−$265.37	$586.88	$684.34	−$147.35
Chicago	479.78	567.24	−87.46	408.51	473.09	−65.18
Los Angeles	482.62	802.88	−320.26	437.14	554.54	−117.40
Phildelphia	438.20	577.32	−139.12	397.75	492.90	−95.15
Detroit	543.81	523.50	+15.31	461.67	434.10	+27.57
Baltimore	431.95	577.28	−145.33	366.07	427.61	−55.54
Houston	290.62	555.25	−264.63	290.09	450.35	−160.25
Cleveland	412.70	585.21	−177.51	370.59	459.50	−88.91
St. Louis	391.33	527.68	−136.35	386.58	423.73	−37.15
Milwaukee	451.54	570.85	−119.31	377.96	469.38	−91.42
San Francisco	550.50	701.69	−151.19	466.77	546.29	−79.62
Boston	385.46	545.80	−160.34	385.46	465.36	−79.90
Dallas	383.36	445.60	−62.34	301.96	325.40	−23.44
New Orleans	278.89	341.66	−62.77	271.87	233.05	+38.82
Pittsburgh	417.85	511.78	−93.93	363.00	450.98	−82.98
San Diego	547.65	697.98	−150.33	414.63	538.95	−124.32
Seattle	492.97	505.79	−12.82	409.89	415.72	−5.83
Buffalo	451.27	660.16	−208.89	447.03	561.20	−114.17
Cincinnati	411.16	745.91	−334.75	376.11	577.74	−204.63
Memphis	$235.17	$356.00	$−120.83	$227.88	$245.71	−$18.13
Denver	426.67	579.97	−103.30	418.30	390.74	+37.56
Atlanta	276.86	352.63	−75.77	272.52	287.80	−15.23
Minneapolis	417.86	626.35	−182.98	414.31	441.45	−27.14
Indianapolis	365.29	650.24	−284.95	352.87	467.92	−115.05
Kansas City	468.23	460.94	+7.29	409.19	350.67	+58.52
Columbus	331.31	398.08	−66.77	327.40	332.66	−4.06
Newark	575.65	612.41	−36.76	496.21	522.23	−26.02
Louisville	301.46	656.04	−356.58	301.44	477.73	−176.29
Portland, Oreg	431.30	602.31	−171.01	421.59	480.14	−58.55
Long Beach	460.58	802.88	−342.30	426.33	554.44	−128.21
Birmingham	239.83	247.64	−7.81	194.43	223.84	−79.46
Oklahoma	279.33	367.88	−88.55	269.23	291.67	−22.44
Rochester	602.71	732.76	−130.05	580.05	573.07	+6.98
Toledo	489.71	676.09	−186.38	377.71	511.85	−134.14
St. Paul	427.91	626.36	−198.45	415.51	441.45	−25.94
Norfolk	271.17	363.30	−92.13	265.43	283.65	−23.22
Omaha	293.08	522.74	−229.66	282.58	304.90	−112.32
Mean	414.46	559.42	−144.96	376.33	441.99	−85.86

Source: Seymour Sacks and David Ranney, "Suburban Education: A Fiscal Analysis," Urban Affairs Quarterly (Sept. 1966). (Revised.)

Table from Alan K. Campbell and Seymour Sacks, "Metropolitan America: Fiscal Patterns and Governmental Systems," N.Y. Free Press 1967.

TABLE 17.—PER CAPITA TOTAL LOCAL EDUCATIONAL EXPENDITURE INCLUDING HIGHER EDUCATION, CENTRAL CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS, 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1957 AND 1964–65

Area	1957			1964–65		
	SMSA	CC	OCC	SMSA	CC	OCC
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	$95	$98	$93	$154	$133	$168
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	99	147	80	183	212	171
San Diego, Calif	80	72	90	132	111	159
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	92	65	112	162	88	192
Denver, Colo	74	73	74	131	104	154
Washington, D.C	69	50	84	140	104	158
Miami, Fla	70	70	70	117	117	117
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	47	47	47	97	97	97
Atlanta, Ga	54	55	53	101	75	123
Chicago, Ill	63	48	86	104	77	136
Indianapolis, Ind	66	62	75	126	93	215
Louisville, Kentucky-Indiana	66	62	71	98	95	102
New Orleans, La	44	46	39	67	61	79
Baltimore, Md	64	59	71	104	90	119
Boston, Mass	63	49	68	97	72	104
Detroit, Mich	89	62	114	128	96	152
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	72	55	96	135	84	195
Kansas City, Missouri-Kansas	59	63	55	108	67	141
St. Louis, Missouri-Illinois	61	46	71	99	82	107
Newark, N.J	85	76	88	130	114	135
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	75	56	81	112	92	118
Buffalo, N.Y	78	52	99	141	87	175
New York, N.Y	82	63	140	141	112	212
Rochester, N.Y	70	53	92	168	128	207
Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana	68	81	55	112	165	80
Cleveland, Ohio	67	50	85	122	94	144
Columbus, Ohio	64	52	94	99	76	158
Dayton, Ohio	66	47	78	116	106	122
Portland, Oregon-Washington	77	75	80	134	124	141
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania-New Jersey	61	49	72	105	74	130
Pittsburgh, Pa	59	41	64	100	78	105
Providence, R.I	49	46	50	82	70	87
Dallas, Tex	64	65	64	92	77	116
Houston, Tex	78	65	126	111	81	207
San Antonio, Tex	53	48	87	86	(1)	(1)
Seattle-Everett Wash	71	57	87	138	(1)	(1)
Milwaukee Wis	65	51	85	108	98	129
Unweighted average	70	61	80	119	99	141
Weighted average	73	61	86	124	99	146

[1] Data not available.
OCC as percent of CC, 1957—141; 1965, 147.—Averages computed for Task Force report.

Source: Compiled from various reports of the Governments Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census

TABLE 18.—PER CAPITA AND PER PUPIL CURRENT EXPENDITURE FOR LOCAL SCHOOLS, CENTRAL CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS, 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1964–65

Area	Per Capita			Per Pupil		
	SMSA	CC	OCC	SMSA	CC	OCC
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	$118	$94	$134	$558	$424	$654
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	123	142	115	578	498	631
San Diego, Calif	107	89	129	549	485	621
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	127	79	158	701	565	758
Denver, Colo	111	95	124	471	493	457
Washington, D.C	107	90	117	545	508	562
Miami, Fla	94	94	94	503	503	503
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	67	67	67	362	362	362
Atlanta, Ga	86	69	100	378	342	403
Chicago, Ill	86	67	109	503	433	578
Indianapolis, Ind	106	79	176	471	407	579
Louisville, Kentucky-Indiana	71	45	97	416	350	455
New Orleans, La	57	50	71	333	310	369
Baltimore, Md	85	81	90	429	407	452
Boston, Mass	84	68	88	493	490	499
Detroit, Mich	108	81	129	509	454	539

Footnotes at end of table.

Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	$108	$80	$135	$564	$527	$587
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	91	59	117	494	425	531
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill	82	68	88	542	411	594
Newark, N. J	106	96	109	595	515	619
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N. J	95	76	101	557	477	579
Buffalo, N. Y	125	74	157	694	507	777
New York, N. Y	121	96	181	790	728	889
Rochester, N. Y	138	104	172	807	700	885
Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana	79	78	79	472	439	494
Cleveland, Ohio	94	81	105	528	433	609
Columbus, Ohio	82	70	115	410	368	500
Dayton, Ohio	101	100	102	481	431	432
Portland, Oregon-Washington	115	92	133	543	444	616
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania-New Jersey	88	63	108	586	447	656
Pittsburgh, Pa	90	58	100	521	419	544
Providence, R.I	70	64	72	430	436	427
Dallas, Tex	73	60	93	422	334	597
Houston, Tex	86	62	164	430	311	794
San Antonio, Tex	65	(1)	(1)	310	(1)	(1)
Seattle-Everett, Wash	119	74	196	527	476	556
Milwaukee, Wis	85	66	116	485	421	568
Unweighted average	97	82	113	514	449	573

[1] Data not available.
CC as percent of OCC: Per capita, 138; per pupil, 128.—Averages computed for Task Force.
Source: Compiled from various reports of the Governments Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census and from the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Table from ACIR, "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System," vol. 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities, Washington, D.C., October 1967, A-31, p. 66.

Table 17 shows the trend between 1957 and 1965 in per capita total educational expenditures comparing central cities and outlying areas. OCC expenditures increased as a percentage of central city expenditures from 141 percent to 147 percent in those eight years.

Table 18 develops the relationship for 1965 in current expenditures per capita and per pupil for the 1964–65 school year, and shows that by either measure, outside-central-city areas devoted more resources to education than did the central cities by considerable margins. It is important to recall at this point in the analysis the two conditioning factors which shape this pattern, namely (1) the high non-educational service responsibilities to which cities must devote 70 percent of their budgets, whereas suburban governments with lesser service requirements devote only 47 percent of their expenditures to non-educational purposes, (see Table 10), and (2) the higher level of total tax effort in the central cities (see Table 13).

2. *The need for additional money in the cities.*—When one combines the picture of higher educational expenditures in the suburbs with the fact that urban education actually costs more per unit than does education in the suburbs, the degree of central city disadvantage is substantially magnified. There are two general reasons why urban education is more expensive than suburban education. First, many items in the school budget are more expensive in cities than they are outside of cities, and second, the socio-economic characteristics of the urban student population make for additional expenditures.

2.1 *Higher cost of wages, services.*—To illustrate the first of these two reasons, Professor Charles Benson, in an unpublished study conducted for the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, isolated one such urban high cost factor. "City costs are characterized by a general expenditure-raising phenomenon, namely, the age of their teachers. Central city school populations are not growing as rapidly as urban ones. Also, for institutional reasons, cities tend to make promotions internally. On both counts, central cities tend to have school systems that are staffed primarily by teachers of substantial seniority. Again for institutional reasons, teachers are paid largely on the basis of seniority. It follows that central cities must pay high salaries per teacher, even though their salary schedules are not as attractive as those to be found in the suburbs" (Benson, 1966, p. 8).

Other examples of higher cost items are those of site acquisition for school construction. Urban land values are generally higher than in outlying areas. In a city like Baltimore, for example, it is not uncommon to pay $300,000 an acre for an inner city elementary school site (Murnaghen & Mandel, 1969, pp. 32–34). Comparisons, of course, are not simple because the urban model for school construction is not the suburban 10 acre school plot. Yet despite the *caveat*, it would seem reasonable to conclude that higher urban land costs affect the city school budget to some extent.

Similarly, the Bureau of Labor Statistics indices consistently show higher urban standards of living, and city wages and salaries for ancillary services to schools therefore tend to be higher According to national school finance specialist, Dr. Eugene McLoone, Assistant Director of Research, National Education Association, and professor of economics at the University of Maryland janitorial and security expenses are widely reported to be higher in city school systems, a function of a variety of causes related to such diverse factors as unionization and higher rates of student vandalism.

2.2 *Higher requirements for special educational attention for the disadvantaged.*—But the most important reason why urban education is inherently more expensive than education in other areas derives from the educational and socio-economic characteristics of city student populations. The poor, the black, the immigrant, the handicapped make up a large proportion of the city student body, and such students have high requirements for special educational attention. Programs for the culturally disadvantaged, programs for non-English speaking adults and children, programs for children to whom standard English is virtually a foreign language, adult education in general, summer schools, programs for the physically and emotionally handicapped (where costs per pupil are greater than normal child costs by a factor of four or five to one) and vocational (Characterized by average costs of 1.35 times those of academic secondary schools)—these are all prominent aspects of urban education because of the ethnic and socio-economic make-up of the city. (Benson, 1966.)

More importantly, however, if improvement and change in curriculum, educational personnel, supplementary services, facilities and attitudes are to take place to educate effectively the inner city population, it will cost more—more per disadvantaged child, more per black child, more per deprived child.

3. Summary

To summarize, in addition to the general fiscal problems facing central cities, the education function itself is subject to higher costs than it is in outlying areas. The higher costs are attributable to items of expenditure that cost more in cities and to the more "expensive" school population that the cities must educate.

Biased State Aid Formulas

Thus far our discussion of educational finance has focused on local revenues and expenditures. But education, like most other functions of government in the American Federal system, is characterized by the involvement of all three levels of government in its operation. In fiscal 1969 in the field of elementary and secondary schooling, the national division of fiscal responsibility is 52.0 percent local, 40.7 percent State and 7.3 percent Federal. The question to be examined now is. To what extent do the substantial State revenues offset or increase disparities between central city and outside central city educational finance?

1. *State impact on educational spending—excluding State aid to education.*—At the outset it is important to recognize that State aid for education is but one aspect of State impact on educational spending. State statutory and constitutional provisions regarding the organization of school districts, permissible tax and debt limits, and responsibility for retirement funds are but a few of the factors playing important parts in shaping patterns of educational finance.

For example, Seymour Sacks, one of the nation's leading experts in educational finance, has noted that in many cases the only schol districts in a State which must bear the responsibility for financing employee retirement systems are the large school districts of the State. And in some cases even where small local school districts are given this responsibility, a heavier assignment may be charged to the large city school district or its overlying government. In all such cases, these costs must be financed almost entirely from local taxes.[8]

To take another example, State policy determines the extent to which taxes may be levied, and complex limits are a common feature of tax law throughout the nation. Many of these provisions came into being in the 1930's and have resulted in a set of

Footnotes at end of article.

rules and regulations which Professor Sacks finds are "*operative* only in so far as they affect the large cities . . . The effect of the tax limits on large cities has been thoroughly inhibiting on large city school finances, which depend almost exclusively on the real property tax base."

Effects of this problem are described in a report prepared for the 1967 New York State Constitutional Convention. At that time, ten of the State's 62 cities were found to be operating at 90 percent or more of their statutory tax limit. Included in the group were all of the States' cities with more than 125,000 population. Four of these large cities (New York, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers) were operating at 99 percent of their limit. For all the six large cities, the fiscal problems were particularly grave. Besides the pressures for more varied services than less populous places, the large cities have the additional burden of having to finance their school systems within the city's tax limit, whereas smaller cities have independent school systems with a separate tax limit unrelated to general service requirements. Another problem relates to the differing treatment of school districts depending on their location. School districts wholly or partly within a city with fewer than 125,000 total population for example, are subject to constitutional tax limit. School districts wholly outside cities are not, and they often oppose annexation to existing cities or inclusion in new ones, whether desirable or not on other grounds, because it would subject them to constitutional tax and debt limits (Local Finance, 1/27/1967, pp. 53–55). While the discussion at this point is addressed directly to New York State, the problems are not at all unlike those existing across the nation.

2. *Effects of State aid to education—disparities in distribution to cities.*—But our concern is primarily with the effect of State aid to education, and here there are also clear differences between the central city and outside central city areas in the amount of aid per pupil and per capita. The history of such aid is an interesting one. State aid systems continue to bear the marks of their origins—the attempt to compensate for the inequalities between what were then the rich cities and the poorer outlying and rural regions. The 1962 published figures show that of the 37 large city areas, the central cities received larger educational aid per pupil in only eight cases (See Table 19). The outside areas received greater aid in the preponderant 29 cases. When examined in per capita terms, only three of the 37 central city areas have greater aid than their outlying areas. And of these three, Oklahoma City represents a very special case because of its extensive nature, and Milwaukee represents a difference of but $1 and neglects the imbalance in noneducational aid. On the average, per capita State education aid in the large city areas was $20.72 while in their outlying area it was almost twice as great, $37.66.

There is also the question of aid as a proportion of expenditures. In this case it is quite evident that both the large central cities and their outlying areas receive a much smaller proportion of their current expenditures in the form of aid than does the nation as a whole. For if the aid figure for the nation is computed on a current expenditure basis, it amounts to some 44.5 percent of the total. Only five of the large city areas in the entire country receive more than that proportion of aid (See Table 20).

TABLE 19.—TOTAL EDUCATION AID PER PUPIL, CENTRAL CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS AND SELECTED LARGE METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1962

Metropolitan area	CC	OCC
New York	$234.00	$296.50
Chicago	111.00	103.00
Los Angeles	172.90	463.50

TABLE 19.—TOTAL EDUCATION AID PER PUPIL, CENTRAL CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS AND SELECTED LARGE METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1962—Continued

Metropolitan area	CC	OCC
Philadelphia	$139.80	$132.10
Detroit	137.00	163.00
Baltimore	106.40	161.80
Houston	143.80	200.70
Cleveland	49.90	96.30
St. Louis	128.80	140.80
Milwaukee	93.00	54.50
San Francisco	188.70	310.40
Boston	50.10	42.10
Dallas	139.80	172.00
New Orleans	194.20	200.20
Pittsburgh	93.30	184.10
San Diego	195.00	281.60
Seattle	234.20	288.50
Buffalo	193.80	287.60
Cincinnati	51.20	145.43
Memphis	107.40	119.20
Denver	73.90	121.80
Atlanta	102.50	152.10
Minneapolis	132.80	367.20
Indianapolis	97.00	125.80
Kansas City	129.80	89.00
Columbus	50.20	114.90
Newark	95.00	65.80
Louisville	123.40	137.30
Portland (Oregon)	114.70	216.20
Long Beach	187.00	401.50
Birmingham	154.40	152.40
Oklahoma City	96.40	58.90
Rochester	186.50	309.80
Toledo	51.60	200.10
St. Paul	129.80	386.20
Norfolk	101.00	117.40
Omaha	33.20	40.00

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Census of Governments, 1962.

TABLE 20.—EDUCATION AID PER CAPITA, CENTRAL CITY CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS AND SELECTED LARGE METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1962

Metropolitan area	CC	OCC	Exhibit—Total education aid as a percent, total education expenditures central city areas (CC)
New York	$30.19	$66.17	38.7
Chicago	15.31	20.45	23.2
Los Angeles	36.19	102.30	35.8
Philadelphia	17.45	24.17	31.9
Detroit	23.62	39.49	25.2
Baltimore	19.83	31.61	24.6
Houston	31.33	51.98	49.1
Cleveland	6.76	12.76	10.4
St. Louis	18.20	24.83	32.9
Milwaukee	13.43	11.91	20.6
San Francisco	23.72	98.34	34.3
Boston	6.54	7.78	13.0
Dallas	27.13	38.74	36.5
New Orleans	29.06	39.01	69.6
Pittsburgh	11.43	34.53	22.3
San Diego	37.43	63.87	35.6
Seattle	42.46	80.03	47.5
Buffalo	25.45	59.80	42.9
Cincinnati	7.73	32.34	12.4
Memphis	22.20	32.34	45.7
Denver	14.06	34.70	17.3
Atlanta	21.25	39.02	37.7
Minneapolis	19.51	93.73	31.0
Indianapolis	18.53	27.89	26.5
Kansas City	20.69	30.21	27.6
Columbus	9.28	28.31	15.1
Newark	15.48	12.04	16.5
Louisville	17.53	28.02	40.9
Portland (Oregon)	21.05	53.52	26.6
Long Beach	34.91	90.06	40.6
Birmingham	31.70	37.85	78.3
Oklahoma City	23.19	13.39	34.5
Rochester	24.56	67.05	30.9
Toledo	8.54	47.51	10.5
St. Paul	17.78	102.03	30.5
Norfolk	17.89	28.28	37.3
Omaha	5.60	10.46	11.3

Source: Compiled from various reports of the Governments Division, U.S. Bureau of Census.

Another way of analyzing the central city-suburban State aid differential may also be found in the Sacks' study (*Educational Finance in Large Cities*). Looking at the broad concept of the New York Metropolitan Region as developed by the Regional Planning Association, we can see the working of three different systems of State aid and their effects on the central cities of their component areas. There are clearly striking differences between the amounts of aid received per pupil in these three States. Using the 1959 average income of $2,306 New York received almost the same amount of aid as Westchester County (less Yonkers) with an average income of $3,427, almost 50 percent higher. The New Jersey levels in 1964 were much lower than these in New York, but the aid per pupil in Newark with an income of $1,792 was slightly lower than the aid received by the rest of the Newark SMSA with an income of $2,746. Similar results occurred in the other parts of the New Jersey area analyzed. An almost identical situation may be found in Connecticut, where Bridgeport, with an average income of $1,955, received almost exactly the same State aid per pupil as did the suburban portion of surrounding Fairfield County, with an average income of $3,208.

Educational aid formulas frequently overstate the fiscal capacity of central cities because their measure of fiscal capacity is almost universally tax base per pupil rather than tax base per capita. This seemingly insignificant factor is in reality of major consequence. For by focusing only upon the per pupil relationship with the tax base, the formulas assume that the fiscal resources of different kinds of school districts, for instance central city and suburban, are equally available for educational purposes. As this chapter has noted at several points already, this is in fact untrue, and central cities have a much heavier general service load than do other kinds of jurisdictions.

3. Summary

In short, for a variety of reasons, it would appear that State governments in general are failing to compensate for the crisis of educational finance facing the large central cities of the nation.[9]

Dwindling Popular Support for and Confidence in Education

Underlying the financial problems of education in large cities is a growing popular unwillingness to raise additional revenues for school purposes at the State and local level. Increasngly, this disposition is running head on into (1) the heightened determination of teachers' organizations to force raises in instructional salaries, and (2) a general rise in prices schools have to pay for facilities, materials, and non-instructional services. In a number of States, Governors and State legislatures have been presented with the spectre of state-wide teachers' strikes or resignations if State aid levels were not raised. At the same time, a mood widely characterized as a taxpayer revolt has caused a more conservative approach in State aid programs. And reapportioned legislatures, whose increased representation has gone primarily to suburban districts, have taken few effective steps to revise State formulas to meet the educational needs of central cities. Even where, as in New York, an urban aid program was pasted onto the pre-existing aid system, the minimal financial amount ($27,000,000 for the entire State) has made its effect barely perceptible.

1. *The heightened impact of lack of public support on the cities.*—In the large cities, the gap between necessary revenues (as seen by the educational system and related organizations) and available revenues (as seen by city governments and large portions of the tax conscious public) threaten an unparalleled crisis for urban education.

Examples of the fiscal crisis may be taken from any section of the nation. This spring in Houston, Texas, voters rejected by a 2 to 1 margin a proposed $5,000,000 tax measure and a $20,000,000 bond issue. While the public debate included a tangle of issues related to the desirability of kindergarten and special education, as well as a general opposi-

Footnotes at end of article.

tion to higher taxes, the net result of the two defeats will be the denial of services to 20,000 pupils from the Houston Independent School District as a means of saving $2.3 million in 1969–70.

The case of Youngstown, Ohio, is another example. Amid a complex political environment, rejection of a school levy in last fall's general election forced the city to shut down its public school system for five weeks. Opposition to increases in the property tax had led to four defeats of school tax proposals in just a twenty-two month period in Youngstown.

In Sacramento, California, a school budget adopted in August was the largest in the city's history, yet required cuts in services and in the number of employees due to pressures from inflation. While increased State aid may permit some small restorations, the new school aid provision approved by the State legislature in August underlined the problems of that city and of others in California: Sacramento's neighboring suburban school district, San Juan, with nearly identical enrollment, received $2,200,000 in new aid; Sacramento received $900,000. San Juan's proportion of minority group students is 3 percent; Sacramento's 33.8 percent.

The largest cities of the nation are also feeling the effects of adverse tax and bond votes. Los Angeles and Philadelphia both had voter rejections of such measures last year, and education officials expect serious impact on the school program in both cities. In the former, three educational bond and tax measures were defeated. In the latter, the defeat of its school bond referendum was the first suffered in the city's modern history. Detroit and New York are other cities whose educational systems are in severe financial difficulty, although adverse public referenda were not involved. In the former, the 1968–69 school budget ran an $8,000,000 deficit, and the 1969–70 projection is for a possible deficit of more than $30,000,000. Local school officials, seeing little chance of increased State or local support, are reported to be considering extended school closing as a mean of coping with their fiscal problems. Other drastic measures under consideration include the increase of class size, and termination of innovative educational programs.

An extensive national survey conducted by the Gallup organization for the Kettering Foundation asked whether repsondents would be willing to approve new measures for higher school funds. Forty-nine percent answered no, another 5 percent indicated they were not sure, and only forty-five percent were willing to indicate their support of further revenue measures. In other respects respondents indicated satisfaction with many aspects of the educational system, including the regard in which they held teachers and the quality of education, according to a front page story in the New York Times of August 17, 1969.

3. Summary

State and local taxation is notoriously regressive and highly visible as compared with the Federal income tax. State sales taxes, which are noted as "pennies for the Governor" with every purchase, and local property taxes, which have little relationship to ability to pay, are widely resented and are in some places reaching the limits of expansion. If needed new support is to be made available for the support of city schools, the share carried by Federal revenues will have to be vastly increased. For the signals, as noted in the examples and trends discussed above, point to a rapidly growing public unwillingness to approve marked increases in State and local revenues.

Financial difficulties of non-public schools

Many of the factors discussed which affect the cities, and in turn the financial situation of the public schools, are also relevant in their effects on parochial and other non-public schools.

Population shifts bringing the poorer, more educationally disadvantaged into the inner city, lowered land values, lack of State and Federal aid have had profound effects on non-public schools which are reverberating to the public schools.

For example, one official for the parochial school system in Detroit informed the Task Force that financial pressures have forced raises in tuition from $50 to $100–$150 per family for elementary school students and from $75 to $150–$200 per student for high school students. As a result, the Catholic schools expect to lose over 5,000 students this year, most of whom will enter the city's public schools. In a further attempt to economize, the parochial system consolidated six of its elementary schools into two schools, thus turning five hundred additional students into the public schools.

Three largely Spanish-speaking schools, totally subsidized by the Church last year, are being forced to close down this year. The kindergartens in these schools, the only ones in the systems, have already been dropped. An inner city high school, which formerly enrolled 700 students, raised its tuition to $250, and now enrolls 350. The parochial school system projects that if it does not receive assistance, it will have to close 75 percent of its schools next year. Last year the parochial schools enrolled 65,000 children.

Such an example is far from atypical. The process is an insidious one which is being replicated in cities across the nation. Non-public schools located in areas of increased populations of disadvantaged families receive increased enrollments. Since tuitions pay for only a portion of per student expenses, the system raises tuitions in order to decrease its budget deficit. In the inner city, lower income families cannot afford these raises in tuition, and remove their children to the public schools. As a result of enrollment losses and continuing financial difficulties parochial schools may consolidate or even close down, and in so doing cause even more students to enroll in public schools whose facilities and budgets are already overtaxed.

The problems of the non-public schools are in a very real sense the problems of the public schools. The problems of the city are the problems of both.

Minimal Level and Minimal Effect of Federal Funds

Simply stated, the funding of Federal programs has not assisted hard-pressed urban areas to meet the educational challenges which confront them.

1. *Small impact of Federal funds on public elementary and secondary schools.*—We first to the aggregate level of Federal money for public elementary and secondary schools. Table 21 illustrates the growth in the absolute amount contributed by the Federal Government over the last twelve years. From 1958 to 1964, Federal funds almost doubled from $486,000,000 to $897,000,000. In 1965–66, with the passage of ESEA, a quantum jump occurred in a single year, with Federal funds more than doubling from $897,000,000 to $1,997,000,000. During the last three years, however, the growth has slowed, and in the last fiscal year it even declined slightly.

Table 22 puts those figures in a somewhat different perspective. By expressing Federal, State, and local funds for education in proportions of total public elementary and secondary education expenditures, we see that the Federal share, after growing from 4.4 percent to 7.9 percent after the passage of ESEA, leveled and then declined over the ensuing three years to 7.3 percent of total expenditures. If the purpose of Federal aid is to encourage local efforts to move in directions consonant with national objectives, such a growth pattern provides small incentive indeed. For not only is the overall proportion of aid relatively marginal (less than 8 percent), but in addition it does not appear to offer a dynamic potential. As noted in the fourth annual report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, "Doubt about the continuing availability of funds inevitably results in a lower-grade staff for Title I projects (some administrators have declared they would not assign their best teachers to a program that may go bust any time!), a preponderance of single purpose programs not integrated with the regular school curriculum, and a minimum of basic changes or improvements in the total curriculum for disadvantaged children." [10] What applies to Title I, applies to many other programs as well.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 21.—REVENUES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS
[In thousands]

School year	Total	Federal	State	Local
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1957–58	$12,181,513	$486,484	$4,800,368	$6,894,661
1959–60	14,746,618	651,639	5,768,047	8,326,932
1961–62	17,527,707	760,975	6,789,190	9,977,542
1963–64	20,544,182	896,956	8,078,014	11,569,213
1965–66	25,356,858	1,996,954	9,920,219	13,439,686
1966–67*	27,256,043	[1] 2,162,892	10,661,582	14,431,569
1967–68*	31,092,400	2,472,464	12,231,954	16,387,982
1968–69*	33,743,748	2,455,547	13,729,344	17,558,857
Increase, 1957–58 to 1968–69:				
Amount	21,562,235	1,969,063	8,928,976	10,664,196
Percent	177.0	404.8	186.0	154.7
Annual rate (percent)	9.7	15.8	10.0	8.9

*NEA research division estimates.

[1] NEA research division estimates of Federal revenue may be lower than those which will be published later by the U.S. Office of Education because of partial omission of money value of food distribution for the school lunch program.

Table from Committee on Education Finance, NEA. "Financial Status of the Public Schools," 1969, Washington, D.C. NEA, 1969 p. 59.

Sources: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. "Statistics of State School Systems, 1965–66," Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1968, p. 11.

National Education Association, research division. "Estimates of School Statistics, 1966–67 and 1968–69." Research reports 1966–R20 and 1968–R16. Washington, D.C., the Association, 1966 and 1968.

TABLE 22.—PERCENT OF REVENUE RECEIVED FROM FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL SOURCES FOR PUBLIC, ELEMENTARY, AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

[In percent]

School year (1)	Federal sources (2)	State sources (3)	Local sources (4)
1957–58	4.0	39.4	56.6
1959–60	4.4	39.1	56.5
1961–62	4.3	38.7	56.9
1963–64	4.4	39.3	56.4
1965–66 [1]	7.9	39.1	53.0
1966–67 [1]	7.9	39.1	53.0
1967–68 [1]	8.0	39.3	52.7
1968–69 [1]	7.3	40.7	52.0

[1] NEA Research Division estimates. NEA "Financial Status," op. cit., p. 60.

Sources: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. "Statistics of State School Systems, 1965–66." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968. p. 11.
National Education Association, Research Division. "Estimates of School Statistics, 1968–69." Research Report 1968–R16. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1968. p. 18.

1.1 *Minimal level of Title I, ESEA poverty designated funds.*—Title I, however, is of particular interest in itself because its funds are allocated on the basis of a poverty formula, thus providing substantial assistance to central cities. The effects of the leveling and decline of Federal educational aid is exemplified by its operation on Title I. Between the 1967–68 and 1968–69 school years, cutbacks of $68 million combined with the growing costs of education resulted in $400 million less for disadvantaged pupils in the local schools this year than was available in the first year of the program (Title I—ESEA, 1969, p. 11). In addition, the growth in the number of eligible pupils—both because of changes in the Federal eligibility formulas and because many cities have experienced marked increases in the number of pupils from families receiving AFDC payments (which increases the number of Title I eligibles)—has made for a sharp decline in funds available per Title I pupil. Testimony presented before the House Education and Labor Committee this Spring showed that in New York State, Title I funds per poverty eligible pupil had declined to little more than half, from $365.64 to $200.10 in the four years of Title I operation (see Table 23).

TABLE 23.—STATEMENT PRESENTED BY IRVING RATCHICK, COORDINATOR OF TITLE I, ESEA, NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Comparative basic data on Title I, ESEA allocations in New York State fiscal years 1966–69

Fiscal year	Maximum basic grant	State allocation	Proration factor	Average net current expense	Prorated per pupil	Total number of poverty eligibles
1966	$109,666,770	$109,666,770	1.00	$365.64	$365.64	299,962
1967	159,451,294	111,091,007	0.70	393.14	273.95	405,584
1968	195,277,704	115,770,356	.59	416.70	247.05	468,629
1969	265,610,797	113,600,524	.43	467.88	200.01	567,706

1.2. *Arbitrary administration of Federal funds resulting in non-target distribution.*—Dilution of the effects of aid to overcome educational disadvantage has occurred not only because of total funding levels but also because of administrative procedures of many State and local education agencies. Since the poverty factor which is used to allocate funds to the county levels is not used in determining the particular children who will benefit from Title I programs (poor educational performance is the criteria), school officials have considerable leadway in determining the particular recipients of Federal funds. By failing to concentrate funds to provide total educational effort directed toward students most in need of compensatory education, many school systems have spread Title I allocations thinly in order to include as many students as possible. The result is a superficial veneer of fragmented programs or new equipment rather than an integrated, high impact intervention to achieve major educational change. In statistical terms this tendency may be seen in the average national expenditure per Title I pupil: $95.00. With the average per pupil expenditure from all sources running just below $700 per pupil nationally, this level of Title I spending is highly unlikely to achieve marked change in the quality of education afforded the educationally disadvantaged.

REVENUE SOURCES PER PUPIL—1967

	ESEA I	Federal Elementary and Secondary education aid	Additional Federal aid for education	Total Federal education aid from all sources	State aid	Total revenue	Enrollment
Schenectady	$28	$22	$10	$60	$454	$1,069	12,480
Niskayuna	6	46	22	84	471	1,173	4,708

Source: The University of the State of New York. The State Education Department Bureau of Educational Research, Albany, N.Y. Prepared by U.S. Office of Education.

1.3. *Lack of time for program planning for use of Federal dollars.*—There are other reasons why Title I of ESEA has failed to bring the degree of aid for urban education problems that was originally expected. Because of the uncertainty and late availability of funds, a circumstance which has prevented educators from being able to plan for Title I as they develop their program months in advance of the start of the school year,[11] ESEA money has largely gone for a variety of special and ancillary programs and has not been utilized to relieve the pressures that bear upon the central portion of the educational curriculum presented to disadvantaged children. Thus, while Title I funds have been of importance to central city school districts and have helped to offset the imbalance of financing described in earlier sections of this paper, the effect has not been even as helpful as the gross figures might suggest.

But Title I represents about 40 percent of Federal aid to public schools. While the formula for the allocation of Title I funds insures substantial equity for central cities, the pattern of distribution of other Federal education programs does not. The point may be illustrated by a specific example, an individual State study, and by a sample of the largest cities in the nation.

2. *Lack of fair-share Federal fund distribution to the cities.*—A specific example of how a very wealthy suburb, by the exercise of the fine art of grantsmanship, can garner substantially more Federal aid than a neighboring deteriorating central may be seen in the case of Schenectady and Niskayuna, New York.

Schenectady, a central city whose relative financial situation to that of Niskayuna can be seen most readily in the fact that it qualifies for three times the Title I aid per pupil, receives $60 per pupil from all Federal programs. Niskayuna, probably the wealthiest suburb in the area, is able to take advantage of a sufficient range of programs to receive $84 per pupil, 140 percent the amount of its proportionately poorer neighbor. (See Table 24).

A recently completed study of Michigan by James W. Guthrie and associates investigated the association between (1) assessed property value per pupil (2) a comprehensive measure of the socio-economic characteristics of school districts, and (3) the flow of Federal aid. The study reported: "In general Federal funds flow in a fashion which permits high SES (socio-economic status) and wealthy districts (high AV/PP) to receive more or as much Federal money per pupil than low SES and poor (low AV/PP) districts." (Guthrie, July 1, 1969, p. 31.)

One study examined entitlements under five Federal programs to compare the share of State allocations going to large cities with the share of the student population in those large cities. Except for Title I of ESEA, the study found that large cities were receiving less than their proportionate share based on their populations. In other words, not only were Federal aid programs not compensating for the special fiscal problems of cities discussed in earlier sections of this paper; Federal aid programs weren't even giving cities their fair share (See Tables 24, 25, and 26). In the fifty largest cities in the nation, with 21.3 percent of the pupil enrollment in their combined 28 States and with 26.4 percent of the disadvantaged by Title I count, their receipts by program were 15.9 percent of Vocational Education funds, 16.2 percent of NDEA Title III (instructional equipment), 18.1 percent of ESEA II (textbooks and library resources), and 20.5 percent of ESEA Title

Footnotes at end of article.

III (supplemental services and centers). Only in ESEA I did the fifty cities receive funds proportional to their percentage of State student population.

TABLE 24.—FEDERAL REVENUE SOURCES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Federal program	Schenectady [1] Amount	Schenectady [1] Per pupil [3]	Niskayuna [2] Amount	Niskayuna [2] Per pupil [3]
ESEA I	$348,800	$27.94	$26,300	$5.58
ESEA II	24,400	1.95	35,100	7.48
ESEA III			134,500	28.57
Total, ESEA	373,200	29.90	195,900	41.61
NDEA III	19,600	1.57	21,700	4.60
NDEA V-A	5,500	0.44	5,200	1.10
Vocational education	50,800	4.07	26,900	5.71
Public Law 874	143,300	11.48	103,100	21.89
School milk and lunch	27,500	2.20	28,100	5.96
Other Federal	129,100	10.34	16,005	3.40
Total, Federal	749,000	60.01	396,905	84.30

[1] Schenectady enrollment (1967) 12,480.
[2] Niskayuna enrollment (1967) 4,708.
[3] Does not add to total due to rounding.

Source: The University of the State of New York. The State Education Department. Bureau of Educational Research. Albany, New York. Prepared by U.S. Office of Education.

TABLE 25.—25 LARGEST CITIES
[City as percent of State]

State and city	Public school enrollment 1966-67	Title I, ESEA, 5-17 (count established fiscal year 1967)	Fiscal year 1967 obligations for— Vocational education	NDEA III	ESEA I	ESEA II	ESEA II
California:							
Los Angeles	14.59	20.60	14.35	0.21	20.03	7.58	5.67
San Francisco	2.49	4.53	3.53	.84	4.38	1.87	3.17
San Diego	2.78	3.09	2.70	2.44	3.03	0.82	2.55
Colorado: Denver	19.38	29.10	12.74	7.81	26.02	17.02	28.65
Georgia: Atlanta	10.53	6.92	5.88	12.10	5.74	22.84	7.95
Illinois: Chicago	26.51	50.89	24.24	29.89	53.87	32.99	17.50
Louisiana: New Orleans	13.02	11.65	9.46	12.53	15.01	20.78	23.38
Maryland: Baltimore	24.31	50.81	7.90	19.62	49.67	10.51	2.65
Massachusetts: Boston	8.68	26.10	3.93	6.17	24.63	6.42	0
Michigan: Detroit	14.79	33.25	25.24	28.47	34.97	14.56	0.50
Minnesota: Minneapolis	8.52	12.61	8.63	15.19	11.20	9.33	8.05
Missouri: St. Louis	13.94	18 90	9.35	3.69	19.44	18.43	21.06
New York:							
New York	33.31	63.80	10.74	34.30	61.39	29.58	28.18
Buffalo	2.26	4.46	3.18	1.62	4.34	2.56	5.02
Ohio:							
Cleveland	8.21	14.31	11.52	4.72	14.70	6.47	5.07
Cincinnati	3.84	8.48	1.46	3.67	8.60	3.09	13.00
Pennsylvania:							
Philadelphia	12.65	25.37	10.88	17.79	24.60	8.51	17.28
Pittsburgh	7.58	6.98	22.83	7.04	6.62	1.84	11.31
Tennessee: Memphis	14.74	9.33	0	0	9.25	13.94	1.16
Texas:							
Houston	10.93	5.23	4.04	5.20	5.13	8.24	12.20
Dallas	5.93	3.76	3.31	4.08	3.69	5.42	.80
San Antonio	5.27	4.39	3.77	1.60	4.30	3.29	7.00
Washington: Seattle	18.46	15.67	18.99	12.55	14.79	12.09	44.36
Wisconsin:							
Milwaukee	13.34	18.37	10.09	11.92	17.84	10.26	15.72
District of Columbia	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: U.S. Office of Education National Center for Educational Statistics Reference, Estimates, and Projections Branch.

The distribution of Federal funds: The 50 largest cities of the Nation have 21.3% of the total school enrollments and 26.4% of the disadvantaged Title I–ESEA children in their combined 28 states.

Yet, in 1967 these 50 cities received only: 15.9% of their States' *Vocational Education* funds; 16.2% of their States' NDEA Title III funds for purchase of instructional equipment; 18.1% of their States' ESEA Title II funds for purchase of textbooks and school library resources; and 20.5% of their States' ESEA Title III funds for supplemental centers and services.

Only in the ESEA Title I program did these cities receive funds proportional to their educational burdens—29.9% of their States' funds.

Some specific examples:

TABLE 26.—DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS
[In percent]

	Total enrollment	Title I count	Vocational education	NDEA title III	ESEA title II	ESEA title I
Birmingham	15.56	5.40	4.27	2.34	5.06	4.92
Los Angeles	14.59	20.60	14.35	.21	7.58	20.03
Denver	19.38	29.10	12.74	7.81	17.02	26.02
Baltimore	24.31	50.81	7.90	19.62	10.51	49.67
Louisville	18.88	4.64	7.55	3.11	6.73	4.79
St. Louis	13.94	18.90	9.35	3.69	18.43	19.44
Kansas City	10.39	7.78	5.41	4.33	14.56	7.58
New York City	33.31	63.80	10.74	34.30	29.58	61.39
Rochester	1.43	1.60	0	1.52	1.84	1.59
Columbus, Ohio	4.57	6.09	1.04	3.84	4.04	6.25
Oklahoma City	12.55	10.49	0	15.38	11.67	9.96
Philadelphia	12.65	25.37	10.88	17.79	8.51	24.60
Pittsburgh	7.58	6.93	22.83	7.04	1.84	6.62
Memphis	14.74	9.33	0	0	13.94	9.25
Houston	10.93	5.23	4.04	5.20	8.24	5.13
Milwaukee	13.34	18.37	10.09	11.92	10.26	17.84

Source: U.S. Office of Education National Center for Educational Statistics, Reference, Estimates, and Projections Branch.

3. Lack of Federal awareness of patterns of allocations

One of the greatest problems in analyzing the impact of Federal educational aid is the immense information gap that exists between what we *should* know about the pattern of allocation of funds and what we actually *do* know. In its draft report, the Committee on Finance and Governmental Relations of the Urban Education Task Force gave particular emphasis to this problem: " . . the Federal Government does not now have a systematic way of measuring its own overall resource allocation priorities in education. The difficulties encountered by the Committee and others in focusing attention on the aggregate impact of Federal aid on a particular type of local district, say, urban districts, underscores the presently fragmented patterns of thinking about federal aid to education. Federal policy toward a particular district is primarily a function of the relative distribution of Federal dollars; today, we discuss future policy without really knowing what present policy is" (Draft Report, Task Force on Urban Education, 5/28/69, pp. 5 & 6).

This is not to say that USOE efforts are not being directed toward studying the allocation of its funds. However, it is our judgment that such efforts are still in their initial stages, and need considerable refinement before they can be relied upon for an accurate picture of fiscal flows in relationship to community characteristics important for educational policy making (J. Froomkin & D. J. Dugan, June 1969).

4. Summary

Despite the paucity of reliable data, some general conclusions can probably be drawn about the impact of Federal aid to education in coping with the problems of the cities. Title I of ESEA, despite the problems discussed above has been an important and welcome source of funds for cities. Its size in comparison with other education programs (40 percent of current Federal aid to public schools) has made for an aggregate impact under which cities appear to get a share of overall Federal funds in an amount proportionate to their population. However, when we examine the other Federal aid programs individually, we find that many of them, even programs such as Vocational Education, are of far more assistance to more favored suburban areas than they are to the central cities. Many wealthy suburban communities, wise in the ways of submitting program applications, have been able to fare better in securing Federal funds than have neighboring cities with problems of property seriously affecting their educational program. Thus, although Federal aid funds taken as a whole may provide the cities as a whole with a share proportionate to their percentage of the population, there is a serious lack of even distribution of funds given for particular individual programs to individual metropolitan areas. Relative allocations distributed by individual programs seldom reflect size or extent of need of the target population. In no sense can one discover in present distribution patterns a focused recognition that the nation has a serious urban education problem.

Summary of Chapter

Cities are facing unique problems which become more complex as the population size increases. Schools and their budgets are affected by a myriad of such problems peculiar to the cities as well as by problems originated by the educational establishment per se.

1. A set of general problems are being suffered by the cities and their results affect education.

a. Cities face financial deterioration as a result of patterns of population migration.

b. Patterns of migration include exit from cities or business and professional populations and entrance by lower income and economically disadvantaged populations.

c. Disadvantaged populations pay fewer taxes and require costlier services than do suburban populations, including an education which is inevitably more expensive than that adequate and appropriate for suburban populations.

d. Loss of business, lowered employment rates, lowering land values are among factors which make the cities' economies too weak to deal adequately with education for the disadvantaged.

e. Problems accompanying cities' density and deterioration demand expensive solutions in areas additional to education. Education receives a smaller share in proportion to the city's total budget than in proportion to the total budget in its suburbs—in spite of the fact that cities tax themselves more heavily than do the suburbs.

f. Cities simply cannot afford as much money for education per pupil as can the suburbs.

2. Education in the cities costs more than education in the suburbs.

a. Higher service costs in the city result in higher costs of educational personnel, maintenance, construction and services.

b. The high poor, black, handicapped, and immigrant proportions of the student body have high requirements for special educational attention.

3. State aid formulas do not offset the disparities between central city and suburban educational costs and spending.

a. Statutory and constitutional provisions of the States which influence patterns of educational finance in such areas as the organization of school districts, tax and debt limits, and responsibility for retirement funds, have often placed unfair burdens and restrictions on the cities.

b. State aid formulas, still operating on the historic assumption that cities were rich and rural areas poor, continue to favor suburban and rural areas to the point where cities seldom currently receive even their fair share.

4. Lack of public confidence toward education has been manifested in a number of ways.

a. As teachers demand higher salaries and as costs for educational materials rise, taxpayers have objected to increased spending on education.

b. Even when school programs are obviously suffering from lack of funds, the public has turned its back as further program cuts are forced. Voters have defeated local school tax and bond issues across the nation.

5. Financial difficulties experienced by non-public schools have created additional difficulties for the public schools.

a. Students who cannot afford non-public schools' raised tuitions enroll in public schools.

b. Financial failures of non-public schools cause whole school populations to enroll in public schools whose budgets and facilities do not increase proportionately.

6. Federal aid has not assisted urban areas to any great degree.

a. The levels of Federal aid are low in proportion to the total cost of education.

b. Actual dollar amounts are low with regard to increase in per pupil expenditures.

c. Administrative procedures of many State and local educational agencies have diluted the effects of aid through poverty formulas.

d. Uncertainty levels and availability of funds have minimized effective planning efforts.

e. Federal funds are distributed in a fashion which permits wealthy districts to receive more than or at least as much Federal money per pupil as poor districts.

f. Funds of many Federal programs are not distributed to the cities in shares which are proportionate to cities' percentages of State student population.

g. The Federal Government does not have a systematic way of measuring its own overall resource allocation priorities in education.

The composite result of the above factors is leading to a disastrous educational situation for many cities across the nation. It is true that several large city systems will find concentration on program improvement impossible as they struggle merely to stay open. A few examples of this are cited below.

In Philadelphia, the 1968–69 educational outlay of $280 million is a "bare bones" budget when compared to that of 1967–68. Only emergency funds provided by the State of Pennsylvania prevented the school system from closing down May 1, several weeks before the normal closing date. The prospects are not improving. Failure of a school capital improvement bond precludes construction of sixty proposed school buildings.

In Detroit, the 1968–69 school year ended with the school system five million dollars in the red. This deficit would have been increased many times over if severe cuts had not been effected in several areas—all of them detrimental to program effectiveness—such as the filling of vacancies, textbook purchase, maintenance program, capital outlay, hiring substitute teachers, etc. The year also ended with 325 fewer teachers than the previous year.

Prospects for this year are indeed bleak. $30–$35 million are needed and the State may be able to provide a maximum of $10 million. With such a deficit, the system must choose the least "evil" from the following choices: (1) keep schools closed until needed funds are guaranteed; (2) open schools as scheduled and operate them until the money runs out; or (3) further curtail an already "subsistence" budget.

In Los Angeles, defeat of tax and bond issues have left a shortage of $32 million in the current years' budget. This deficit will mean the cutting of crucial elements of the school program, a freeze on the hiring of needed additional staff, and the possibility of being forced to close down in April of 1970.

The few examples above are far from unique. Such statements will be reflected to varying degrees in all of the large cities of the nation. Specifically, too many are faced with: (1) deficits from last year; (2) defeat of bond issues; (3) impossible alternatives of substandard programs or early closing dates; (4) continuing deterioration of facilities for which there is no money to maintain or rebuild; (5) inability to keep good teachers for lack of salary incentives; and (6) inability to hire urgently needed additional staff members.

Current budgets are barely providing the subsistence for operational expenses. And while it is true that money alone cannot guarantee educational program effectiveness, it is equally true that without first providing "survival" operational funds and second, massive additional funds to plan, develop staff and program, and implement the type of education which produces useful urban citizens, there is no chance for success.

Program failures *do* occur through lack of commitment, lack of expertise, and/or attitudes which anticipate failure. Program failures *must* occur when there is a desperate lack of sufficient funds to pay for what is needed. This chapter has documented this desperate lack.

Chapter III. The urban environment of the students

In the preceding chapter, both the causes and the extent of the massive financial crisis confronting large urban areas and their schools were clearly documented. However, the financial crisis in urban education is not the whole of the problem. The urban environment of the student—its impact, its offerings, its differences—is a major part of this problem, as characterized by divergent value systems, overcrowding, under-housing, high cost of living, low levels of income, too much discrimination, too little food, and too much noise. While the charge of this particular Task Force was focused on urban education—the students and the system, it is completely unrealistic to consider urban education apart from its context. For it is the elements interacting—often explosively—within this context which directly contribute to urban education's unique and monumental problems.

In considering these elements and their interactions, it is an extremely difficult task to rank many of the identified elements, including their effects and interactions, in terms of their significance for the urban student and his learning. Some, of course, are clearly more significant than others, such as health and food, but beyond the basic survival level, the ordering by significance becomes increasingly less clear. Moreover, cause and effect relationships are difficult to determine because of interactions among the elements. In effect, everything relates to everything else. Nevertheless, this truism is the key point to bear in mind throughout this chapter. For it is the combination of these environmental elements and their interactions in various configurations which impacts on the student's potential and largely influences the extent to which this potential will be—or can be—realized, the directions it will take, and the number of feasible options it will have.

We contend that the combination of elements in the urban environment which is bombarding on this impoverished student has created a set of special needs above and beyond those of other impoverished students. Therefore, this chapter is focused on: (1) analyzing what we have identified as the major sets of elements, including their effects and interactions, which are continuously influencing the urban student; and (2) establishing the special nature of their influence upon him. While we recognize that the educational system is an integral part of the urban student's environment, it is treated separately in the ensuing chapter because of the special focus of the Task Force. Within each section, clusters of major elements are presented with considerable attention given to those concerned with basic physical survival. For some elements, the data are definitive while, for others, the available evidence is limited. And there are some for which little "hard" evidence was found to be available other than experience and anecdotal report. In no case, are the data exhaustive. However, they are intended to present a firm foundation on which to establish the magnitude and major features of the urban education problem. Only on this kind of foundation can the urgency of our recommendations—and our credibility—be established.

The specific sections are: (1) health and nutrition: (2) economic status and employment; (3) housing and living conditions; and (4) the family of the inner city student. In the summary section we present the major conclusions and implications derived from the preceding sections as they relate to education.

Health and Nutrition

Most basic of all the clusters of elements in terms of physical survival are those associated with health and nutrition. In this section, we are concerned with: (1) documenting the incidence of health and nutritional problems among the impoverished urban groups; and (2) describing the effects of these problems on the quality and length of their lives with the major focus on education.

Malnutrition, Its Extent and Effects

Malnutrition, a major corollary of poverty, is a basic fact of life in America. Of the ap-

proximately *10.5 million children* living in poverty throughout our nation, it is estimated that for many of them, food is either unavailable or insufficient to meet even the minimum standards required to sustain a healthy child (U.S. Senate, Hearings, 1/1969, p. 344). In the urban areas where the majority of these children live, malnutrition exists almost exclusively among the racial and ethnic minority groups of the inner city (U.S. Senate, Hearings, 1/1969).

In a major study involving ten States, the National Nutritional Survey (Schaefer & Johnson, 1969, p. 10), a major attempt was made to define the nutritional status of America. Five approaches were used in securing the data: clinical, biochemical, dietary, dental, and socioeconomic.

The study's sample, studied in depth and carefully selected, is well worth mentioning. Fifty-five percent of the sample examined was Negro. Twenty-five percent of the families were Spanish-American. Forty-one percent of this group spoke Spanish as the principal—and most frequently the only—language. An age distribution of the groups particularly vulnerable to nutritional stress shows: Children 0–6 years constituted 19 percent of the total group. Children 10–16 years constituted 25 percent of the total group. Adults 60 years and older constituted 13 percent of the total group. Only 50 percent of the male respondents reported working full-time in the month and year preceding their examination at the local cooperating clinic where the survey was conducted.

Some of the clinical findings are of major significance. Approximately 4 percent of the babies and children up to six years of age showed evidence of Vitamin D deficiency; 18 cases of rickets were diagnosed. Four to 5 percent of the subjects exhibited winged scapula and potbelly, systematic of protein/calorie malnutrition. Goiter is endemic; 5 percent of all people examined have an enlarged thyroid gland. Eight cases of Bitot's spots related to Vitamin A deficiency were noted and confirmed. Four percent of all surveyed exhibited scorbutic gum lesions. Changes in hair, skin, and lips, which may be indicative of poor general nutrition, were also found.

The children studied between one and three years of age were considerably below the average height of children in the U.S.A. Three times the expected number of children fell below the sixteenth percentile on the Iowa Growth Chart. A number of this group were more than 10 percent below the average height for their age.

Lastly, the survey revealed seven cases exhibiting severe general malnutrition of kwashiorkor (severe protein and multiple nutrient deficiency) and marasmus (primarily a caloric deficiency). Wrist bone X-ray data is presently being analyzed for further evidence of growth retardation. Analysis of the first 120 x-rays of preschool children indicates that growth in about 3.5 percent is retarded.

Biochemical laboratory findings were also characteristic of poorly nourished populations. From 9 to 19 percent of those tested had blood and urine levels less than adequate for good health. Some of these findings are:

1. One-third of the children under six had hemoglobin levels diagnosed as anemia and requiring medical attention. While fewer of the older people had anemia, many had hemoglobin levels indicative of poor nutritional health.

2. The findings for Vitamin A present a somewhat similar picture. One-third of the children under six had less than adequate serum levels of Vitamin A.

3. Urinary riboflavin and thiamine levels were also low in a substantial portion of the total studied. Analysis of the first 2,400 urine samples revealed 19 percent of the people had low levels of urinary riboflavin. Nine percent had low levels of urinary thiamine. Here again, the pattern of widespread malnourishment was reaffirmed.

4. Serium Vitamin C levels were less than adequate in 12 to 16 percent of all age groups. These findings suggest the intake of food supplying Vitamin C is less than it should be among these people. This deficiency of Vitamin C occurred primarily in children under six.

5. Sixteen and three-tenths percent of all surveyed showed less than adequate serum protein levels. Seventeen and one-tenth percent of the serum albumin levels were similarly depressed. These values are *below* those observed in foreign populations.

The dietary inadequacies vary between the age groups. Iron intake is low in more than 60 percent of the young children. Adolescents and older individuals have inadequate intake of Vitamin A. Almost 40 percent of both groups consume less than half the amount considered adequate. However, early trends in certain dietary and biochemical values appear to support each other. For example, one-third of the children less than six years old were anemic. In the same group, the food eaten contained considerably less than adequate amounts of iron, an important nutrient in maintaining adequate hemoglobin levels.

In general, this study concludes that malnutrition and the ill health largely engendered by it may negatively and directly affect the development of the central nervous system. Such an effect on the nervous system will eventuate either in patterns of clinically definable malfunctioning or in sub-clinical conditions (Schaefer & Johnson, Spring, 1969). As any psychologist or educator knows, such patterns have negative functional consequences for normal development and the capacity to learn. When we consider the vast number of children living in poverty who are all probably experiencing at least some degree of malnutrition, the findings and the major conclusion from this study alone are of the gravest concern.

The work of Densen (1967), Haynes (1967), and Baumgartner (1965) all indicate that we have yet to learn the full magnitude of the nutritional problems of blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans. However, with the information which is available, it is clear that widespread malnutrition is definitely a characteristic of impoverished urban groups.

Our primary concern here, however, is not with an exhaustive documentation of malnutrition and ill or marginal health among urban minority groups in and of itself. Such documentation is the concern of other studies. Rather, we are pointing out that the impoverished urban resident—regardless of his age—is not only prey to malnutrition and its attendant health problems but to their effects as well. These effects have significant complications for the whole quality of his life, of which education is a crucial part.

The relationships among poverty, malnutrition, and education have been explored in considerable detail. Findings from studies present a discouraging picture of the impoverished urban student with regard to the likelihood of his achieving successfully in the educative process as it is currently conceived and implemented in the schools. As the following reports show, this student has little of the "background readiness" which the schools have typically assumed—and required—when he enters the kindergarten or the first grade; and, in all probability, he will be unable to make up this "readiness" just through receiving successive years of schooling.

According to one report (Cracioto, et al., 1966), there are at least three ways in which malnutrition indirectly affects the learning of the child. One is his lack of responsiveness to his environment, which results in a lessened amount of time being spent in learning from it. Over a period of time, the result is the loss of months of needed experience. This factor alone can produce developmental and learning lags.

A second factor is below noted.

"Interference with the learning process at specific times during its course may result in disturbances in function that are both profound and of long term significance. . . . (There is a) relationship between the age at which malnutrition develops and learning. . . . As contrasted with older patients, infants under six months recovering from kwashiorkor did not recoup their mental age deficit during the recovery period. . . . (There is evidence that) indicated a strong association between the persistence of later effects on mental performance and the age at onset of malnutrition and its duration." (Cravioto, et al, 1966 p. 399).

A third factor has to do with parent-child interactions, i.e., parental response to a child is in part a function of the child's reactivity. Malnutrition reduces responsiveness resulting in various levels of apathy. A lack of responsiveness on the part of the child can have negative effect on the amount of responsiveness (e.g., affection, verbalization) given to the child by his parent(s). Apathy begets apathy which produces a cumulative pattern of reduced adult-child interaction. This pattern has major consequences in terms of the child's general capabilities for stimulation, learning, and social interaction. For the school, with its demands for verbal capabilities a rapid rate of performing tasks, and group operations, this pattern of apathy creates serious problems. Virtually the same factors were reported in a later study by Birch. Specifically, he found that:

"Children who are ill-nourished are reduced in their responsiveness to the environment, distracted by their visceral state, and reduced in their ability to progress and endure in learning conditions." (Birch, 1968, p. 598.)

Furthermore, as was reported in another study the apathy, factor can often be confused with mental retardation by teachers which, in turn, leads to a lower set of expectations for impoverished children (Stemmler, 1966).

Concerning mental retardation and other disabilities, Sarasan (1959) reported that the incidence of mental retardation is *not* randomly spread throughout the population. Beyond the level of chance, mental retardation is most prevalent in the impoverished groups. Moreover, his studies reveal its linkage to malnutrition and ill health. In the same vein, Kessler (1958) reported that neurological and physical disabilities were also more prevalent among impoverished groups than among higher income groups. As with mental retardation, linkages of these kinds of disabilities to malnutrtion and ill health were noted. Figures reported in both these studies were based on predominently urban groups.

Infant and Childbirth Mortality Rates

Another element in the health and nutrition area is infant mortality. According to Dr. Charles Upton Lowe, Chairman, Committee on Nutrition, Academic of Pediatrics, the rate of infant mortality "may be the hallmark of poverty in the U.S.A." (Lowe in U.S. Senate, Hearings, 1/1969, p. 1091).

As he further stated in an appearance before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Need, the rate of premature births is also from two to three times higher among poverty families than among the well-to-do (Lowe, in U.S. Senate, Hearings, 1/1969, p. 1091). Additional evidence concerning the rates of infant mortality among impoverished urban minority groups compared with white groups is presented for twelve major cities in Table 1 on the following page (Infant and Perinatal Mortality in the U.S., 10/1965, p. 12). Although there is considerable variation shown in the comparison of white and non-white groups in the three

categories, the striking fact which emerges is that for each category in every city, the non-white mortality rate exceeds the white. A companion table using the same source presents data on white and non-white infant mortality in terms of causes (See Table 2). Among the most striking figures in this table are those given for pneumonia, unqualified neonatal disorders, effects due to mother's disease during pregnancy, and diseases in early infancy. In these instances, the rate for the non-white group is usually twice—and, sometimes, more—as great as that for the white groups. Thus, it can be seen that there is a far higher rate of infant mortality among families in poverty than for those not in poverty. Moreover, the infant mortality rate within urban areas is much higher for the racial and ethnic minorities than for the white majority.

TABLE 1.—AVERAGE ANNUAL INFANT MORTALITY RATES BY AGE AT DEATH AND COLOR[1]

Area	Rates per 1,000 live births					
	Under 1 year, 1960–61		Under 28 days, 1960–61		28 days–11 months, 1960–61	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
New York, NY	21.5	41.3	16.2	30.5	5.3	10.8
Chicago, Ill	23.1	37.9	16.9	25.2	6.3	12.7
Los Angeles, Calif	22.1	29.9	16.9	22.4	5.2	7.5
Philadelphia, Pa	24.8	41.2	19.5	30.3	5.3	11.0
Detroit, Mich	24.7	37.0	19.3	28.1	5.5	8.8
Baltimore, Md	25.3	40.3	19.3	29.6	6.0	10.8
Houston, Tex	22.9	36.9	17.8	21.6	5.1	15.2
Cleveland, Ohio	24.8	38.0	19.5	30.6	5.3	7.4
Washington, D.C	28.3	39.4	22.4	29.5	5.9	9.9
St. Louis, Mo	24.5	43.9	18.6	31.8	5.9	12.0
Milwaukee, Wis	23.2	34.0	18.4	25.2	4.8	8.9
San Francisco, Calif	22.8	26.3	17.0	19.6	5.8	6.7

[1] Infant and perinatal mortality in the United States. Public Health Service Publication, Washington, D.C., 1965, p. 72.

TABLE 2.—AVERAGE ANNUAL INFANT MORTALITY RATES FOR SELECTED CAUSES OF DEATH, BY AGE AT DEATH, AND COLOR, 1959–61

[Rates per 10,000 live births in specified color group]

Cause of death (7th revision—International Classification of Diseases)	Under 1 year	Under 28 days	Under 1 day	1 to 6 days	7 to 27 days	28 days to 11 months
WHITE						
All causes	228.5	172.2	95.6	60.0	16.6	56.3
Infective and parasitic diseases (001–138)	2.6	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	2.3
Influenza and pneumonia, including pneumonia of newborn (480–493,763)	22.9	6.6	0.8	2.8	3.0	16.3
All other diseases of respiratory system (470–475,500–527)	5.3	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.3	4.6
Gastritis and duodenitis, etc. (543, 571, 572, 764)	4.0	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.5	3.4
All other diseases of digestive system (530–542, 544–570, 573–587)	3.6	2.4	0.9	0.9	0.6	1.2
Congenital malformations (750–759)	37.5	25.0	10.1	9.3	5.6	12.5
Birth injuries (760, 761)	23.4	23.3	15.7	7.1	0.5	0.0
Intracranial and spinal injury at birth (760)	6.9	6.9	2.7	3.7	0.4	0.0
Other birth injury (761)	16.5	16.5	12.9	3.4	0.1	0.0
Postnatal asphyxia and atelectasis (762)	42.2	41.6	24.9	15.8	1.0	0.5
Hemolytic disease of newborn (770)	5.6	5.5	3.8	1.6	0.2	0.0
Immaturity unqualified (776)	39.4	39.2	27.5	10.6	1.1	0.2
Neonatal disorders arising from certain diseases of mother during pregnancy, etc. (765–769, 771–774)	24.0	22.6	10.6	10.2	1.8	1.4
Symptoms and ill-defined conditions (780–793, 795)	2.8	1.1	0.5	0.4	0.3	1.6
Accidents (E800–E962)	7.3	1.1	0.1	0.4	0.6	6.2
Residual (140–468, 590–749, E963–E985)	8.1	2.3	0.7	0.8	0.8	5.8
Certain diseases of early infancy (760–776)	141.7	139.5	83.2	48.2	8.1	2.2
NONWHITE						
All causes	425.3	268.6	143.3	85.3	40.1	156.7
Infective and parasitic diseases (001–138)	7.9	1.5	0.1	0.3	1.1	6.4
Influenza and pneumonia, including pneumonia of newborn (480–493, 763)	75.3	19.2	2.2	6.5	10.4	56.1
All other diseases of respiratory system (470–475, 500–527)	11.3	1.2	0.3	0.3	0.6	10.1
Gastritis and duodenitis, etc. (543, 571, 572, 764)	23.0	3.9	0.0	0.3	3.6	19.1
All other diseases of digestive system (530–542, 544–570, 573–587)	4.7	2.3	0.4	1.1	0.8	2.5
Congenital malformations (750–759)	30.4	17.8	6.4	6.8	4.6	12.6
Birth injuries (760, 761)	26.9	26.8	16.9	8.9	1.0	0.1
Intracranial and spinal injury at birth	11.2	11.2	4.8	5.6	0.8	0.0
Other birth injury (761)	15.7	15.6	12.0	3.4	0.2	0.1
Postnatal asphyxia and atelectasis (762)	64.8	63.5	41.2	20.0	2.3	1.3
Hemolytic disease of newborn (770)	2.2	2.2	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.1
Immaturity unqualified (776)	77.8	76.9	51.6	21.0	4.3	0.9
Neonatal disorders arising from certain diseases of mother during pregnancy, etc. (765–769, 771–774)	46.7	38.0	18.2	14.0	5.8	8.8
Symptoms and ill-defined conditions (780–793, 795)	22.2	9.2	3.8	3.2	2.2	13.1
Accidents (E800–E962)	17.0	3.0	0.4	1.1	1.5	14.0
Residual (140–468, 590–749, E963–E985)	15.0	3.6	1.0	1.1	1.5	11.4
Certain diseases of early infancy (760–776)	241.1	230.0	130.9	71.5	27.5	11.2

SOURCE: "Infant and Perinatal Mortality in the United States," Public Health Service, October 1965, Washington, D.C. table 9, p. 76.

With regard to mortality rates of mothers in childbirth, the non-white rate well exceeds that of the white rate. For example, in 1930, twice as many non-white mothers died in childbirth as did white mothers. In 1960, four non-white mothers died in childbirth for every white mother who died. The overall trend is toward the reduction of deaths in childbirth in the 1960s. However, when the figures for white and non-white mothers are examined separately, the non-white rate is well in excess of the white (Baumgartner, 4/1965, p. 495).

In addition to the kind of care received, the linkage to health and nutrition are again manifested.

Life Expectancy

Numerous factors enter into computing the life expectancies of individuals and groups. However, without the fundamental elements of adequate nutrition and health, the life expectancy of an individual is likely to be shortened. For this reason, the information on this element is presented here.

While gradually increasing for Americans generally, life expectancy for the black man has not increased. In fact, it has dropped slightly. What is even more striking is that the decrease is higher among black men in their prime working years, as can be seen from Table 3. An inference which can be drawn from this table is the probability of an increase in widowhood among the blacks. Extrapolating further, such figures suggest that an increasing number of families will be without a male head during the critical years of the children's development.

Indeed, as Douglass reported in an article, "The Urban Negro Family," there were proportionately more widows among non-white women than white. Twenty percent of non-white women were widows in 1960 as compared with under 7 percent for white women. Another finding reported was that non-white women become widows earlier than white women (Douglass in *The American Negro Reference Book*, 1966, p. 340).

From such information, it is compartively easy to infer the kinds of effects the lack of a male head of household could have on a family's economic and emotional stability—and, particularly, on the family's children. We shall return to considering these and other effects in the fourth section of this chapter.

ECONOMIC STATUS AND EMPLOYMENT

A basic pair of elements in terms of physical survival are those of economic status and employment. Certainly, no other elements are more directly connected to poverty than these. In this section, we present their main dimensions for the inner city residents, and note their relationships to education.

Economic Status: For Americans as a whole, income levels are rising, resulting in a general improvement in economic status. Our concern here is to what extent this general improvement is reflected in the economic status of those Americans living either in poverty or in near poverty.

Between 1959 and 1967, there was a major increase in the proportion of Negro families with higher incomes in metropolitan areas. In 1967, approximately one-fifth had incomes over $10,000, double the proportion in 1959. While this increase was taking place, it was only one-half the percentage of white families in the same income bracket (U.S. Bureau of Census, Feb., 1969, p. 42). Table 4, on the following page, indicates that the median family income for the Negro has substantially increased, but it is still only 68 percent of the white family income (Bureau Census,

1969 (a)). Table 4 also shows income comparisons between white and black workers for two time periods in the central cities in terms of female and male, part-time and full-time. In every instance, the white workers fare much better than their black counterparts.

Another comparison is afforded by examining income in terms of the number of earners in white and black families. Again, using 1959 and 1967 as the baselines, we find that in 1967 the median income for the Negro family with one earner in the inner metropolitan areas was $4,199. For the white inner city family with one earner, it was $7,285. If there were two earners in the black family, then the median income figure rose to $7,225. The median income for black families with two earners was still less than that for white families with only one earner (U.S. Bureau of Census, Feb., 1969, p. 44). Figures quoted here in terms of blacks are equally relevant to Spanish-speaking minorities as well.

From these comparisons, we find that there is an increase in income over the last eight years for both white and non-white families in the central cities. However, we still find that the median income of the non-white family is still well below that of the white family in the inner city. Moreover, to approximate the median income earned by one white earner per family there must apparently be two black earners per family.

TABLE 3.—LIFE EXPECTANCY [1] IN PRIME WORKING YEARS, 1960 AND 1966

	1960			1966		
	Nonwhite (years)	White (years)	Difference	Nonwhite (years)	White (years)	Difference
At age:						
25	43.1	48.3	−5.2	43.1	48.6	−5.5
35	34.3	38.8	−4.5	34.4	39.1	−4.7
45	26.2	29.7	−3.5	26.4	30.0	−3.6
55	19.3	21.5	−2.2	19.4	21.8	−2.4

[1] Additional years of life expected.

Source: Center for Urban Education.

TABLE 4.—MEDIAN EARNINGS OF WHITE AND NEGRO WORKERS IN CENTRAL CITIES (1967 DOLLARS)

	Male			Female		
	1967	1959	Percent change, 1959–67	1967	1959	Percent change, 1959–67
White:						
All workers	$6,465	$5,430	19	$3,063	$2,616	17
Year-round workers	7,264	6,132	18	4,144	3,896	6
Proportion of workers with year-round work	74	67	(1)	57	48	(1)
Negro:						
All workers	$4,380	$3,435	28	$2,197	$1,421	55
Year-round workers	5,179	4,271	21	3,020	2,295	32
Proportion of workers with year-round work	68	57	(1)	55	42	(1)
Negro median earnings as a percent of white:						
All workers	68	63	(1)	72	52	(1)
Year round workers	71	70	(1)	73	59	(1)

[1] Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce; Bureau of Census, "Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas." Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 27, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1969, p. 47.

With only one earner according to these figures, the black family is still on the brink of poverty—if not "over the cliff" in it.[12]

Support for this conclusion is to be found in Table 5 on the next page. In comparing the numbers and percent of black and white Americans classified as being in poverty in 1959 compared with 1967, there is an overall decrease in the actual numbers so classified for both the black and white groups. However, we find a staggering number of Americans designated as being below poverty level for whom the affluent society simply does not exist. However, in examining the percents reported in Table 5, we find that in the metropolitan areas, the incidence of poverty is three times as great for black Americans as it is for white (Bur. Census, Feb. 1969, p. 52).

Tables 6, 7, and 8, on three successive pages, supplement the information presented in Tables 4 and 5. Table 6 presents the total number of families residing in six large metropolitan areas in 1960 categorized by: (1) residents of central city versus those outside the central city; and (2) percent of those who are classified as having incomes below poverty level. Clearly apparent from this table is the factor of poverty density. That is, the heavy concentration of families classified in the economic status of poverty is found in the cities. San Antonio, with its heavy concentration of Spanish-surname Americans, shows the greatest density in terms of percents (Louria & Stokes, 1968, p. 3).

TABLE 5.—INCIDENCE OF POVERTY [1] AMONG PERSONS

	Number of persons below poverty level (millions)		Percent below poverty level	
	1967	1959	1967	1959
United States [2]	26.1	39.4	13	22
Metropolitan areas	13.2	18.3	10	17
Central cities	8.3	11.3	14	20
White	4.7	7.1	10	15
Negro	3.5	4.1	30	43
In metropolitan areas of 1,000,000 or more	4.5	5.1	15	17
White	2.3	3.1	10	13
Negro	2.1	2.0	28	36
In metropolitan areas under 1,000,000	3.8	6.1	14	23
White	2.4	4.0	10	17
Negro	1.4	2.1	33	54

[1] The poverty definition (as developed by the Social Security Administration) is based on the minimum food and other needs of families, taking account of family size, number of children, and farm-nonfarm residence. The poverty threshold for a nonfarm family of 4 was $3,335 in 1967 and $3,060 in 1959.

[2] An error was found in the original processing of the income data from the March 1968 CPS. Consequently, the revised 1967 poverty data shown here differ slightly from those published in "Current Population Reports," Series P-60. No. 55.

Source: Bureau of the Census, Trends in Social and Economic Condition in Metropolitan Areas, U.S. Department of Commerce February 1969, p. 52.

Table 7 presents the percent for non-white families living in the central city, in the poverty area, in the classification of poverty. Again, the density factor appears (Louria & Stokes, 1968, p. 4). The combination of the in-migration of the non-whites to the central city and the out-migration of the whites to the suburbs which has occurred since 1960 suggest that the numbers and percents of impoverished Americans concentrated in the central city will show a marked increase when the 1970 census data are compiled.[13] It must also be pointed out that the number and percent of families living right on the brink of poverty in the central city were not reported in these tables. Such information on marginal poverty families would considerably alter the picture of the central city by increasing both the number and percentage distributions.

Table 8, based on 1966 data, presents information on poor and non-poor families in terms of residence, race, age of head of household, and economic status. Several striking relationships can be seen in this table. One is the high concentration of poor non-white families in the inner city, regardless of age of head of household. Another clearly indicates the exodus to the suburbs on the part of the non-poor whites. In comparing percents in terms of the poor within the SMSA [14] and the poor outside of it, it is apparent that there is a much greater percent—and number—of poor families living within the SMSA (Jackson & Welten, June 1969, p. 7).

TABLE 6.—FAMILIES RESIDING IN POVERTY AREAS HAVING INCOME BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL IN 6 METROPOLITAN AREAS—1960 CENSUS [1]

Metropolitan area	Total number of families	Percent in poverty area	Percent below poverty level
New Orleans:			
Central city	152,518	67.1	25.6
Outside central city	58,643	37.0	16.0
San Antonio:			
Central city	137,758	50.8	28.6
Outside central city	18,872	41.0	21.0
St. Louis:			
Central city	191,873	47.4	19.1
Outside central city	339,039	7.1	9.6
Pittsburgh:			
Central city	151,874	44.7	16.0
Outside central city	470,401	15.1	11.4

Footnotes at end of table.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 6.—FAMILIES RESIDING IN POVERTY AREAS HAVING INCOME BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL IN 6 METROPOLITAN AREAS—1960 CENSUS [1]—Continued

Metropolitan area	Total number of families	Percent in poverty area	Percent below poverty level
Washington, D.C.:			
Central city	173,695	42.8	16.7
Outside central city	305,212	3.8	6.0
Baltimore:			
Central city	229,069	41.0	17.9
Outside central city	194,411	10.7	8.6

[1] Poverty level has been defined by the Social Secuirty Administration. It takes into account family size, composition and farm-nonfarm residence with the ceiling in 1959 set at $5,448 for a nonfarm family headed by male with 7 or more members having 1 related child under 18 years of age, Poverty areas is based on a poverty index usuing 5 socioeconomic characteristics: (1) percent of families with money incomes under $3,000 in 1959, (2) percent of children under 18 not living with both parents, (3) percent of persons 25 years and over with less than 8 years of school completed, (4) percent of unskilled males (laborers and service workers) in the employed civilian labor force, (5) percent of housing units dilapidated or lacking some or all plumbing facilities. Although poverty area and poverty level are mutually exclusive terms, there is a natural overlap, i.e., people below poverty level tend to live in poverty areas. For a precise analysis, see "Poverty Areas in the 100 Largest Metropolitan Areas," PC (S1)-54, supplementary reports, 1960 Census of Population, Bureau of the Census, Nov. 13, 1967.

Source: Louria & Stokes, POD/OE/HEW 1968, "Profiles of Twenty American Cities," p. 3.

FIGURE 9.—NONWHITE FAMILIES IN 11 METROPOLITAN AREAS ACCORDING TO RESIDENCE, POVERTY AREA, AND POVERTY LEVEL

Metropolitan Area	Percent in central city	Percent in poverty area	Percent below poverty level
Milwaukee	99.0	83.3	30.4
Chicago	93.3	75.7	29.3
New York	90.6	71.1	25.8
Cleveland	97.5	73.2	27.8
Washington	86.3	61.3	26.0
St. Louis	72.6	86.9	42.1
Buffalo	84.2	78.7	34.3
Baltimore	87.8	77.1	35.3
New Orleans	88.1	92.6	51.1
Boston	80.0	69.2	28.4
Philadelphia	79.8	71.5	30.7

Source: Louria & Stokes, OPD/OE/HEW, Profiles of Twenty Major American Cities, p. 4.

TABLE 8—FIGURE 7

Race and age of head	Number of families (in thousands)	Percentage distribution							
		Inside SMSA					Outside SMSA (rural)		
		Total	Central city	Fringe	Total	Urban	Total	Nonfarm	Farm
POOR									
White [1]	4,375	49.1	24.4	24.7	51.0	15.2	35.8	27.8	8.0
22 to 54	2,371	50.7	24.8	25.9	49.3	15.6	33.7	25.6	8.1
55 to 64	558	42.0	23.7	18.3	58.0	10.9	47.1	33.5	13.6
65 and over	1,277	48.0	23.6	24.4	51.9	15.8	36.1	30.2	5.9
Nonwhite [1]	1,711	53.9	44.0	9.9	46.0	16.7	29.3	21.3	8.1
22 to 54	1,511	58.6	48.5	10.2	41.3	16.5	24.8	18.3	6.5
55 to 64	243	37.9	29.2	8.2	62.2	29.6	41.6	27.2	14.4
65 and over	261	42.5	33.3	9.6	57.5	16.8	41.0	31.4	9.6
NONPOOR									
White [1]	39,641	65.7	27.4	38.3	34.3	13.4	20.9	15.5	5.4
22 to 54	27,586	66.9	25.6	41.3	33.1	12.8	20.3	15.9	4.4
55 to 64	6,393	64.7	31.1	33.6	35.3	13.7	21.6	13.9	7.7
65 and over	5,094	61.4	32.5	28.9	38.7	15.3	23.4	15.2	8.2
Nonwhite [1]	3,195	79.8	62.7	17.1	20.3	8.1	12.2	10.1	2.1
22 to 54	2,336	82.4	64.6	17.9	17.6	7.2	10.4	8.9	1.6
55 to 64	497	74.2	56.9	17.3	25.8	8.5	17.3	14.9	2.4
65 and over	296	66.2	55.4	10.8	33.8	14.9	18.9	12.8	6.1

[1] Includes families with a head under 22, not shown separately.

Source: Jackson, Carolyn and Welten, Terri, "Residence, Race, and Age of Poor Families in 966." Social Security Bulletin, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1969, p. 7.

For the residents of the cities, the actual number of families involved are probably even greater than these figures on poverty would indicate. The poverty definition is based upon a national norm in relation to the minimum needs of families' food, clothing, shelter, etc. The costs for these items are far higher in the cities, especially the larger ones. In March 1969, the Bureau of Labor Statistics published data concerning the minimum amount of money required for a family of four to live on with any degree of security in urban centers if it wanted to have a "sense of self-respect and social participation." These figures presented in Table 9 are well in excess of the national poverty threshold (Bureau of Labor Statistics, March 1969, pp. 1–92).

It should be remembered that these figures are conservative since they are computed in the spring of 1967 and that there has been an increase in consumer prices since that time. In 1967, the median earning of professional and managerial black workers was $6,208. White collar Negro median salaries were $5,515, and black service workers had a median salary of $4,159. Comparing these figures with those in Table 9 indicates that better than 50 percent of all professional blacks would be below the self-respect level required for living in Los Angeles and San Francisco. All other blacks would be below the "self-respect" level in any of the twelve major cities across this nation. In central cities the plight of the Negro is even worse. In 1967, the median income of year-round Negro workers was $4,380. The figure means that somewhat less than three-fourths and more than one-half of all black families in inner cities across this nation are unable to live at a level of "self-respect and social participation" (New York Times, March 16, 1969, p. 1).

TABLE 9.—*Low living financial requirement for urban family of 4*

New York City	$6,021
Chicago	6,104
Los Angeles	6,305
San Francisco	6,571
Milwaukee	6,104
Cleveland	5,915
Washington, D.C	6,133
St. Louis	6,002
Philadelphia	5,898
Detroit	5,873
Baltimore	5,820
Houston	5,542

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., *Three Standards of Living for an Urban Family of Four Persons*, March 1969, p. 16.

It seems apparent that the national standard for poverty, at least in terms of family income, is much too low. These figures clearly indicate that the cost of living in the city—and particularly in the central city—is actually forcing more families into poverty than is generally realized.

In considering the generally lower income of the ethnic and racial minorities in the cities when compared with the median income ($7,264) of his white fellow worker (U.S. Bur. Census, Feb. 1969, p. 47) an easy

and less emotionally loaded explanation than the one of discrimination comes to mind: the educational achievement levels *must* be different when the minority groups are compared with the whites. That this explanation simply will not suffice is demonstrated by Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10 presents the median years of schooling for persons by age, sex, and race. With only one exception, the striking fact which emerges from this table is that there is very little difference in any of the categories for comparison. The median years of schooling completed for Negroes increased by about one year during the period of 1960–68. During this same period there was little change in the educational level of whites in the inner cities. The median differences between black and white central city males is but 4 months in years of schooling.

TABLE 10.—MEDIAN YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED FOR PERSONS 25 TO 29 YEARS OLD, BY SEX

	Metropolitan areas, total		Central cities		Suburban rings	
	1968	1960	1968	1960	1968	1960
Both sexes	12.6	12.4	12.5	12.4	12.6	12.4
White	12.6	12.4	12.6	12.5	12.7	12.4
Negro	12.3	11.4	12.2	11.4	12.3	10.0
Male	12.7	12.4	12.6	12.4	12.7	12.5
White	12.7	12.5	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.5
Negro	12.3	11.3	12.3	11.3	12.4	11.1
Female	12.5	12.3	12.5	12.3	12.6	12.4
White	12.6	12.4	12.5	12.4	12.6	12.4
Negro	12.2	11.4	12.2	11.5	12.3	9.9

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce; Bureau of Census, Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan "Areas," 1969, p. 22.

TABLE 11.—MEDIAN INCOME FOR WHITE AND NEGRO MALES 25 TO 52 YEARS OF AGE BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED

	Central cities			Suburban rings		
	Median income		Percent increase	Median income		Percent increase
	1967	1959	1959–67	1967	1959	1959–67
WHITE						
Elementary: 8 years of less	$5,658	$5,137	10	$6,454	$5,507	17
High School: 1 to 3 years	6,748	5,788	17	7,495	6,342	18
4 years	7,543	6,265	20	8,188	6,774	21
College: 1 year or more	9,222	7,686	20	10,499	8,726	20
4 years or more	10,261	8,486	21	11,536	9,536	21
NEGRO						
Elementary: 8 years or less	4,215	4,215	23	4,021	2,750	46
High School: 1 to 3 years	5,086	4,059	25	4,631	4,050	14
4 years	5,642	4,323	31	5,980	4,333	38
College: 1 year or more	7,025	5,022	40	7,320	5,167	42
NEGRO MEDIAN INCOME AS A PERCENT OF WHITE						
Elementary: 8 years or less	75	67	(1)	62	50	(1)
High School: 1 to 3 years	75	70	(1)	62	64	(1)
4 years	75	69	(1)	73	64	(1)
College: 1 year or more	76	65	(1)	70	59	(1)
4 years or more	74	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Not applicable.

Source: Bureau of the Census, "Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas," U.S. Department of Commerce; 1969; p. 26.

Table 11, again, arrays the educational data for white and non-white males living in the central cities and suburban rings and compares them for median income. However, the really depressing—and equally striking—fact which emerges here is that the income level of the black male is markedly less than for his white counterpart—regardless of his education or area of residence. This table also makes it very clear that in both cities and suburbs the 1967 median income of male Negro high school graduates was about the same as that of white males who had only attended elementary school. A Negro college graduate was barely making more annual income than a white high school graduate.

While these figures give no indication of the quality of the education which the white and non-white groups received, it is apparent that differences in educational achievement level, translated here as number of years in school, afford no real explanation. Other factors are obviously involved. The immediate explanation which comes to mind—quite apart from the educational quality of the schooling received—is racial and ethnic discrimination on a grand scale. Moreover, it takes little effort for any member of any of the racial and ethnic groups to arrive at the same explanation. The typical admonishment to a high school student from the minority groups to stay in school now so he will have an opportunity for a better income later receives only partial support from the figures presented in Tables 10 and 11. He may have an opportunity for a better income in comparison with those from the minority groups if he does stay in school, but in all probability, he won't have an equal opportunity when compared with his counterpart from the white majority group.

In this section, the economic status of impoverished urban citizens has been largely treated in terms of two indices, income level and the below-poverty classification. However, there is a third index which should be mentioned, namely, welfare support. As would be expected for those Americans struggling in poverty, a large percentage of them receive some degree of welfare support. In 1961, Negro children constituted 46 percent of all children receiving AFDC in the country. In inner cities, 75 percent of the children aided were non-white. Although in 1961, the median number of monthly payments received was 20.8 for Negroes as compared to 11.5 for whites, nearly 50 percent of all Negro families on AFDC had monthly incomes of $120 or less as compared to 39 percent of all white families. In fact, one of every five blacks on AFDC had a monthly income of $80 or less, which equals $960 a year (Polski & Brown, 1967, Table 33).

Employment

A comfortable and cherished myth has been: the "better" the education an individual secures, the greater will be his opportunity to secure a "better" job—including the impoverished individual. We have already provided some evidence which sharply contradicts this belief—at least for the racial and ethnic minorities living in urban areas. In this section, we provide additional evidence in further contradiction of this myth. For it is within the central city that educational attainment is most dramatically linked to unemployment and underemployment.

As general background information, it should be noted that big city economies have changed from a past dependence upon craft skills and job flexibility to abilities correlated with literacy and formal education. Furthermore, as Chapter 4 explains in detail, the in-migration of groups from rural and non-urban areas has flooded the cities with Americans whose skills and knowledges are often of little saleable value in terms of employment. These Americans, without either adequate financial resources or adequate urban capabilities, gravitate to the already overcrowded inner city and its poverty. By far, the greatest number of these immigrants are from the racial and ethnic minorities. The net effect of the non-saleable skills can be seen in the following kinds of information.

In a survey of eight large cities conducted by the Department of Labor in 1966, the rate of unemployment in slums was three times the national average (Manpower Report, 4/1967, pp. 74–75). The survey found that a disproportionately large number of slum dwellers were neither working nor looking for work. This "nonparticipation rate" was 11 percent among men aged 20 to 64 living in slum neighborhoods. The sample survey reported that the average rate of "subemployment" for the ten slums was 34 percent. Lack of formal education and vocational training was reported to be the principal reasons for unemployment and sub-employment among slum residents. In these neighborhoods, a third of all unemployed adults had never attended high school, and two-thirds had not graduated from high school.

Approximately a year later, another survey of 100 cities reported on the worst poverty sections of these cities. For the last quarter of 1967, adult blacks had an average city-wide unemployment rate of nearly 7 percent as compared with 3.2 percent in other sections. For whites, the rates were 3 percent and 5 percent respectively in non-poverty and poverty sections. For blacks, the rates were 9 percent [15] in the poverty areas and 5 percent outside of them (U.S. Bur. Labor Stat., January 16, 1969).

In 1968, the average unemployment rate decreased from 5.2 percent in poverty sections and to slightly less than 3 percent in non-poverty sections. For blacks, the rate was 6.4 percent in poverty sections and 2.5 percent outside of them (U.S. Bur. Labor Stat., January 16, 1969). While these figures show reductions over a period of time in the unemployment rates for blacks, they also show that the blacks are trailing well behind the employment rate of the general population of the central city.

Table 12, shows the unemployment rates in percents for non-whites and whites over a twenty-year time period (1948–1968), including the ratio of non-white to white. Since 1961, the unemployment rate for both white and non-white has been decreasing, but the unemployment rate for blacks continues to be twice that of whites.

However, the really striking figures with regard to unemployment emerge when we examine the unemployment rate among teenagers. In *One Year Later* (1969), the following information was reported:

"Black teenagers, in the final quarter of 1967, had an unemployment rate of a staggering 34 percent, worse, than even the (Kerner) Commission had estimated. By 1968 it had been reduced to 27.3 percent. The gain was highly significant but did not remove the problem of idle youth from the streets of the slums and ghettos." (*One Year Later*, 1969, pp. 10–11).

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 12.—UNEMPLOYMENT RATES,[1] 1948-67, AND 1968 (1ST 6 MONTHS)

	Nonwhite	White	Ratio, nonwhite to white
1948	5.2	3.2	1.6
1949	8.9	5.6	1.6
1950	9.0	4.9	1.8
1951	5.3	3.1	1.7
1952	5.4	2.8	1.9
1953	4.5	2.7	1.7
1954	9.9	5.0	2.0
1955	8.7	3.9	2.2
1956	8.3	3.6	2.3
1957	7.9	3.8	2.1
1958	12.6	6.1	2.1
1959	10.7	4.8	2.2
1960	10.2	4.9	2.1
1961	12.4	6.0	2.1
1962	10.9	4.9	2.2
1963	10.8	5.0	2.2
1964	9.6	4.6	2.1
1965	8.1	4.1	2.0
1966	7.3	3.3	2.2
1967	7.4	3.4	2.2
1968 (1st 6 months, seasonally adjusted)	6.8	3.2	2.1

[1] The unemployment rate is the percent unemployed in the civilian labor force.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Recent Trends in Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States, July 1968, p. 11.

Tables 13 and 14 show the comparisons between adults and teenagers in terms of unemployment rates. While employment rates are higher for both white and non-white teenagers than for adults the figures shown for non-white teenagers are as striking as those reported by the preceding source.[16] Table 14 also makes it clear that this high teenage unemployment situation has existed for quite some time—without any real evidence of remediation.

The implications of these figures on the teenagers alone are, indeed, staggering when we consider the wastage of human resources—not to mention the costs which may be incurred in such areas as welfare, crime, and perhaps rehabilitation.

There is one additional pattern to the employment picture of impoverished groups within urban areas which must be mentioned. The black woman—and, to a lesser extent, the Spanish-surname woman, has more consistently been able to secure employment in comparison to the black male.[17] What is apparently happening now is that she is beginning to climb up the economic ladder at a more rapid rate than he is. A trend is developing which indicates that the woman will not only be a more consistent earner in the household but, in relation to the male head of household, she will also be the major earner.

TABLE 13.—UNEMPLOYMENT RATES BY SEX AND AGE, 1967 AND 1968 (1ST 6 MONTHS) [1]

	Nonwhite		White	
	1967	1968	1967	1968
Total	7.3	6.8	3.3	3.2
Adult men	4.5	4.0	2.1	2.0
Adult women	6.9	6.4	3.7	3.4
Teenagers [2]	26.4	24.7	10.2	10.9

[1] Average, seasonally adjusted.
[2] "Teenagers" include those 16 to 19 years old.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1969. Recent Trends, July 1968, p. 13.

TABLE 14.—WHITE AND NEGRO UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN CENTRAL CITIES FOR SELECTED GROUPS

	White	Negro	Ratio Negro to white
1968			
Both sexes:			
16 years and over	3.5	7.8	2.2
16 to 19 years	12.3	30.4	2.5
Male:			
20 years and over	2.5	6.0	2.4
Married, wife present	1.8	4.5	2.5
Female, 20 years and over	3.5	5.9	1.7
1960			
Both sexes:			
16 years and over	4.9	10.7	2.2
16 to 19 years	9.8	22.7	2.3
Male:			
20 years and over	4.8	9.9	2.1
Married, wife present	3.4	7.5	2.2
Female, 20 years and over	4.3	10.1	2.2

Source: U.S. Labor Statistics, Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas, February 1969, p. 31

The implications of this pattern are of particular significance in terms of the development of the male child's masculine roles and responsibilities or, in other words his self-concept. When this situation of female dominance at home is coupled with the "petticoat rule" of the classroom—particularly, at the elementary level, the implications for the male child's development are, indeed, serious.

However, the employment patterns and unemployment rates do not tell the whole story. There is another element involved of equal seriousness, specifically, underemployment or subemployment.

In *One Year Later*, the kinds of jobs available to blacks were summarized from the Kerner Commission Report, as follows:

"It found that Negro men are three times as likely as whites to be in unskilled or service jobs (based on 1960 Census Bureau figures). The concentration of male Negro employment at the lowest end of the occupational scale, the Commission said, is 'the single most important source of poverty among Negroes'." (*One Year Later*, 1969, pp. 4–5).

Based on a later compilation of information, Table 15, on the following page, shows that almost one half of the white males employed in central cities worked as white collar workers whereas only one-fifth of the Negro males were so employed. There has been little change in the occupational distribution of either white or Negro men since 1960.

TABLE 15.—DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS IN CENTRAL CITIES EMPLOYED IN NONAGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS

	White		Negro	
	1968	1960	1968	1960
MALE				
Total (millions)	11.2	12.1	2.3	1.9
Total, percent	100	100	100	100
Professional and managerial workers	30	26	9	6
Clerical and sales workers	17	19	12	12
Craftsmen	21	21	13	11
Operatives	19	21	32	31
Laborers	5	5	17	22
Service workers	8	7	17	17
FEMALE				
Total (millions)	7.1	6.8	1.8	1.3
Total, percent	100	100	100	100
Professional and managerial workers	20	19	11	8
Clerical and sales workers	48	49	23	13
Private household workers	3	3	20	34
All other service workers	12	11	27	26
Craftsmen, operatives, and laborers	16	18	19	18

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas, February 1969, p. 33.

In contrast to this is the marked increase of white collar jobs for black women from 1960 to 1968. The rise is from one-fifth in 1960 to one-third in 1968. The increase is accounted for among clerical and sales workers. Black domestic workers were far fewer in 1968 than 1960.

The "Kerner Commission" reported that in addition to the 2 million unemployed, about 10 million people are underemployed, 6.5 million of whom work full-time and earn less than the annual poverty wage (Kerner, 1968, p. 231). Many of the rioters, the Commission pointed out, were employed, but worked in intermittent, low status, unskilled jobs—jobs which they regarded as below their level of education and ability (*Nat. Adv. Com. on Civil Disorders*, 1968, p. 232).

The *Manpower Report of the President*, April, 1968, published a new national subemployment measure reflecting the judgment that workers with low earnings may have problems which are as persistent and grievous as those of many workers with substantial unemployment. The measure is a conservative one which focuses on the most serious elements of unemployment and low earnings. It includes two distinct groups: (1) workers who were unemployed 15 or more weeks during the year; and (2) those who made less than $3,000 for year-round, full-time work (*Manpower Report of the Pres.*, 1968, p. 34). Table 16, over page, is based on the new measure and indicates that in 1966 there were three times as many nonwhtles as white men who were subemployed.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 16.—SUBEMPLOYMENT INDICATORS FOR MEN, 1966

	Nonwhite	White
Subemployment rate, 1966	21.6	7.6
Indicators of subemployment: Number of low earners, 1966 (in thousands)	635	1,417
Monthly average number unemployed 15 weeks or more, 1966 (in thousands)	69	255

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of the Census, "Recent Trends in Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States," Washington, D.C., July 1968, p. 17.

A new Labor Department study of the Washington labor force reported in *The Washington Post* (5/18/1969) broadens the subemployment measure to more accurately describe the extent of joblessness and underemployment in a large urban center. In the new study, the subemployment rate for Washington is 23.1 percent. The following categories were used to arrive at the above figure: (1) the unemployed; (2) workers who hold full-time jobs receiving incomes below poverty level (as defined by the Labor Department in 1968; (3) part-time workers who would like to work full-time; and (4) people who need work but are not actively searching for jobs (normally called non-participants in the labor market who are not counted in monthly unemployment statistics).

Comparisons of "under-utilization" rates—as the study calls subemployment, show Negroes consistently in an inferior position as Table 17 indicates. When intermittent employment, low-wage work, and other factors are also included as a measure of deprivation, conditions in slum areas are seen to be especially acute. According to Department of Labor statistics, the subemployment rate in nine selected slum areas in 1966 was 32.7 percent. Table 18 indicates the rates for each of the nine areas.

TABLE 17.—UNDER UTILIZATION RATE, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 1968

Age group	White male	Negro male	White female	Negro female
14 to 21	11.4	31.9	9.5	40.7
22 to 44	3.0	12.0	5.5	13.6
45 to 64	5.1	10.0	4.9	10.4
65 and over	5.1	11.0	4.4	10.5

Source: Robert J. Samuelson, the Washington Post, May 18, 1969.

TABLE 18.—EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS IN 9 SERIOUSLY DISADVANTAGED SLUM AREAS, NOVEMBER 1966

Unemployment rate in United States	3.5
Unemployment rate in 9 slum areas (estimated average)	9.5
Subemployment rate (unemployment and estimated underemployment): [1]	
Total, 9 slum areas	32.7
Boston: Roxbury area	24
New Orleans: Several contiguous areas	45
New York City:	
Central Harlem	29
East Harlem	33
Bedford-Stuyvesant	28
Philadelphia, North Philadelphia	34
Phoenix: Salt River bed area	42
St. Louis: North side	39
San Francisco: Mission-Fillmore	25

[1] Subemployment includes: (1) the unemployed as usually defined (those unemployed and actively looking for work); (2) part-time workers wanting full-time employment; (3) full-time workers with weekly earnings as follows: heads of households under 65 years old earning less than $60 per week working full time and individuals under 65 who are not heads of households and earn less than $56 per week in a full-time job; (4) half the adult males not in the labor force; and (5) half the adult males estimated to have been missed in the survey.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of the Census, "Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States," Washington, D.C., October 1967, p. 97.

Housing and Living Conditions

Resulting largely from the problems associated with low levels of employment and economic status is another whole set of problems associated with the elements of housing and living conditions. Basically, these elements can be considered from two vantage points. The first is to view them strictly in terms of their measurable physical characteristics, e.g., condition of dwellings, kinds of facilities per unit, number of poor people in the cities, and overcrowding. The second is to view these elements of housing and living conditions in terms of the quality or style of living which they engender. In this section, we outline some of the key features from the first vantage point and consider their significance for education. In the next section on the family, we consider the second vantage point.

Substandard Housing

While there was a sharp decline in the proportion of substandard [18] houses among non-whites between 1950 and 1960, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders nevertheless made the following statement:

"Nationwide, 25 percent of all non-whites living in the central cities occupied substandard units in 1960, compared to 8 percent of all whites. Preliminary Census data indicate that by 1966, the figures had dropped to 16 and 5 percent respectively. However, if "deteriorating" units, and units with serious housing code violations are added, the percentage of non-whites living in inadequate housing in 1966 becomes much greater." (*Rep. Nat. Adv. Com. on Civil Disorders*, 1968, p. 257).

Table 19, on the following page, cites the proportions of all non-white housing units designated as deteriorating, dilapidated, or lacking full plumbing for 14 of the largest cities of the U.S. in 1960 (*Rep. Nat. Adv. Com. on Civil Disorders*, 1968, p. 257).

TABLE 19.—SUBSTANDARD HOUSING IN 14 OF THE LARGEST U.S. CITIES—1960

City	Percentage of nonwhite occupied housing units classified deteriorating, or dilapidated, 1960	Percentage of nonwhite occupied housing units classified deteriorating, dilapidated, or sound, but without full plumbing, 1960
New York	33.8	42.4
Chicago	32.1	42.8
Los Angeles	14.7	18.1
Philadelphia	28.6	32.0
Detroit	27.9	30.1
Baltimore	30.5	31.7
Houston	30.1	36.7
Cleveland	29.9	33.9
Washington, D.C	15.2	20.8
St. Louis	40.3	51.6
San Francisco	21.3	34.0
Dallas	41.3	45.9
New Orleans	44.3	56.9
Pittsburgh	49.1	58.9

Source: Report of The National Advisory Commission on Civi Disorders, Washington, D.C., March, 1968, p. 257.

As can be seen, these percents are generally much greater than the 25 percent cited above for substandard housing in the nation. It was also reported that blacks, on the average, occupy much older housing than whites.

Precise information on overcrowding (e.g., number of people in housing units over and above the number for which such units were designed) and the problems with dilapidated housing has been difficult to gather in statistical form for the general inner city areas. The following account, however, reflects only too faithfully what most people who have ever lived in or worked in ghetto areas have experienced. It was made by the principal of a school in New York's inner city.

" 'As for housing,' Shapiro continued, 'our *middle-income* housing is the low-income St. Nicholas housing project. They send us about three hundred and fifty children. The housing conditions for many others are very bad. Across the street a house built for eight families has forty-five. Next door there are two houses with serious heating problems. Two winters ago, I spent hours trying to track down the owner, and finally I told the man who said he was only the agent that if heat wasn't provided, there'd be a picket line of teachers and me. There was heat for the rest of the winter. The next year there was no heat again and we couldn't even find the agent. Finally the city took it over as a public nuisance. Another time for another building, we found someone in the Mayor's office who was vulnerable to picketing and he arranged for the city to take that one over. Nonetheless, the furnace remained broken, and it took us fifteen days of constant pressure to get it fixed." (Hentoff, 1966, p. 6).

Th findings from the "Kerner Commission" concerning the housing and living conditions in 1967 are applicable in 1969. Specifically, in the large cities surveyed, the findings were:

1. Blacks either pay the same rent and receive less for their money than do whites or they pay more rent for the same accommodations.

2. Blacks are discriminated against in terms of the enforcement of building codes by both landlords and municipal authorities.

3. The housing conditions in which non-whites (24 percent of all units) live are overcrowded and the physical facilities are inadequate (Forty-seven percent of the units occupied by non-whites in the disturbance areas were classified as non-standard.)

4. Poverty is the foremost reason for the black to live in substandard housing.

5. Discrimination in the housing market is the second major reason which forces non-whites into ghetto housing.

6. Inadequate Federal building programs have done comparatively little to alleviate the housing problems for improverished inner city residents (*Nat. Adv. Com. on Civil Disorders*, 1967, p. 258–259).

Taken together these findings provide meaning for the bleak term racial and ethnic isolation. In *One Year Later* (1969), it was noted that while some improvements had been made, the major problems remained. The general conclusion drawn is below-noted:

"Progress in dealing with the conditions' of slum-ghetto life has been nowhere near in scale with the problems, nor has the past year seen even a serious start toward changes in national priorities, programs, and institutions advocated by the Commission. The sense of urgency in the Commission report has not been reflected in the nation's response." (*One Year Later*, 1969, p. 62).

Related Factors: New Homes, Poverty Families, Birth Rates, and Population Projections.—That the situation is not likely to improve just through the filtering down of "prosperity" is well illustrated by the following information on the housing market, the number of impoverished families in the nation, birth rates, and the population projections. With regard to the purchase of new homes, the following statement is made in *Housing America's Low- and Moderate-Income* [19] *Families:*

Families.—"For families just above the poverty level, it is clear that opportunities to purchase new homes at prevailing prices and at market interest rates are generally unavailable. In 1966, only 0.7 percent of the purchasers of FHA-insured new homes under the conventional FHA Section 230 program had effective annual incomes of less than $4,000; only 2.9 percent of the purchasers had incomes between $4,000 and $4,999; and only 8.3 percent had incomes between $5,000 and $5,999." (Keith, 1968, p. 1).

When these percents are considered in relation to the numbers of families which are

Footnotes at end of article.

represented, the problem of moving out of substandard housing into adequate housing becomes one of massive proportions. Table 20 presents the figures for these for poor households in 1959 and 1966 classified by age, sex, category of farm or non-farm, and race.[20]

TABLE 20.—NUMBER OF POOR HOUSEHOLDS AND INCIDENCE OF POVERTY, 1959 AND 1966

Characteristics of head of household	Number of poor households (millions)[1]		Incidence of poverty (percent)[2]	
	1959	1966	1959	1966
Nonfarm	11.6	10.3	22.5	17.6
White	9.0	7.9	19.6	15.3
Male head	5.0	3.9	13.4	9.4
Under 65 years	3.3	2.4	10.2	6.8
Aged (65 years and over)	1.7	1.5	34.0	24.7
Female head	4.0	4.0	45.2	37.7
Under 65 years	2.2	2.0	37.8	30.5
Aged (65 years and over)	1.8	2.0	59.3	48.9
Nonwhite	2.6	2.4	48.9	37.5
Male head	1.4	1.2	39.7	92.6
Under 65 years	1.2	.9	36.7	23.3
Aged (65 years and over)	.2	.3	64.4	51.4
Female head	1.1	1.2	69.4	60.8
Under 65 years	.9	.9	68.1	58.8
Aged (65 years and over)	.2	.2	76.3	69.9
Farm	1.8	.6	40.9	20.8
White	1.3	.5	34.7	16.9
Nonwhite	.4	.2	85.0	69.7

[1] Households are defined here as the total of families and unrelated individuals.
[2] Poor households as a percent of the total number of households in the category.

Note: Poverty is defined by the Social Security Administration poverty-income standard.

Source: N. Keith, "Housing America's Low- and Moderate-Income Families" 1968 Research Report No. 7 Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office p. 2.

Taking the comparative birth rates for blacks and whites into account provides yet other information concerning the increasing gravity of the situation. Table 21, which follows, shows the ratios for white and nonwhite births for three time periods. Again, citing from the *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders:*

"The . . . Negro population is now growing significantly faster than (the) white population. From 1940 to 1960, the white population rose 34.0 percent, but the Negro population rose 46.6 percent. From 1960 to 1966, the white population grew 7.6 percent, whereas (the) Negro population rose 14.4 percent, almost twice as much.

* * * * *

"(A) Consequence of higher birth rates among Negroes is that the Negro population is considerably younger than the white population. . . . About 35 percent of the white population was under 18 years of age, compared with 45 percent for Negroes." *About one of every six children under five and one of every six new babies are Negro* (Emphasis supplied) (Nat. Adv. Com. on Civil Disorders, 1968, p. 116).

Just the increased number of children involved—even without considering other enviroment-originated problems which they may have—is cause for serious concern on the part of school systems with their already overtaxed facilities and pared-down budgets.

Footnotes at end of article.

If the problems are already massive in terms of the sheer numbers and percents involved using the information available in this decade, the problems become almost unimaginable when the population movements and growth are projected to 1985. Population growth and density more than any other factor, projects a picture of the inner city in the not-too-distant future which is as disturbing as it is startling. In regard to changes in central city and suburban residence, projections indicate great differences between whites and non-whites.

TABLE 21.—LIVE BIRTHS PER 1,000 WOMEN AGED 14–44

Year	White	Nonwhite	Ratio of nonwhite to white
1940	77.1	102.4	1.33
1957	117.4	163.4	1.39
1965	91.4	133.9	1.46

Source: Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, March 1968, p. 116.

According to Table 22, the white metropolitan population would increase by 51.5 million, or 52 percent, between 1960 and 1985. However the white population residing within central cities would experience a decline of 2.4 million or 5.0 percent. White population residing within suburbia, on the other hand, would increase by 53.9 million, or a gain of 104 percent. Non-whites population would double in metropolitan areas, growing by 13.8 million or 104 percent. Within central cities non-whites would almost double, growing from 10.4 million in 1960 to 20.1 million by 1985, a gain of 94 percent.

In consequence, the dramatic rate of suburban growth not withstanding, 75 percent of non-whites residing in SMSA's in 1985 would be living in the central cities, a decline of only 3.8 percentage points over the 1960 total of 78 percent. In dramatic contrast, only 30 percent of white metropolitan residents would live in central cities by 1985, a decline of 18 points from the 1960 level of 48 percent. Thus, more than two-thirds or 70 percent of white persons living in SMSA's would reside in suburbs compared to 25 percent of non-white metropolitan residents (Hodge & Hauser, 1968, p. 25).

The problems created by the increasing numbers of children, by the inevitable deepening of the bitterness and frustration which racial and ethnic isolation and discrimination have bred, and by the never-ending cycle of poverty, are also increasing the magnitude of the problem confronting urban education. Specifically, the schools will face more children with more needs and parents with less tolerance for unsaleable and invalid education and less acceptance of the schools' current brands of expertise.

TABLE 22.—PROJECTED GROWTH 1960 TO 1985 WITHIN COMPONENT PARTS OF METROPOLITAN AREAS[1] BY COLOR BY REGION

[Numbers in thousands]

Region, color, and residence	1985	1960	Increase 1960 to 1985		Percent by residence within SMSA's		
			Number	Percent	1985	1960	Change
United States:							
White	151,164	99,692	51,472	51.6	100.0	100.0	
Central city	45,435	47,852	−2,417	−5.0	30.1	48.0	−17.9
Ring	105,730	51,840	53,890	104.0	69.9	52.0	+17.9
Nonwhite	26,974	13,192	13,782	104.5	100.0	100.0	
Central city	20,146	10,356	9,790	94.5	74.7	78.5	−3.8
Ring	6,827	2,836	3,991	140.7	25.3	21.5	+3.8
Northeast:							
White	41,423	32,388	9,035	27.9	100.0	100.0	
Central city	13,485	14,925	−1,440	−9.6	32.6	46.1	−13.5
Ring	27,938	17,463	10,475	60.0	67.4	53.9	+13.5
Nonwhite	5,905	2,962	2,943	99.4	100.0	100.0	
Central city	4,833	2,398	2,435	101.5	81.8	81.0	+.8
Ring	1,072	564	508	90.1	18.2	19.0	−.8
North Central:							
White	38,698	27,718	10,980	39.6	100.0	100.0	
Central city	11,326	13,793	−2,467	−17.9	29.3	49.8	−20.5
Ring	27,372	13,925	13,447	96.6	70.7	50.2	+20.5
Nonwhite	5,944	3,245	2,699	83.2	100.0	100.0	
Central city	5,318	2,849	2,469	86.7	89.5	87.8	+1.7
Ring	627	396	231	58.3	10.5	12.2	−1.7
South:							
White	35,362	21,183	14,179	66.9	100.0	100.0	
Central city	11,236	11,144	92	0.8	31.8	52.6	−20.8
Ring	24,126	10,039	14,087	140.3	68.2	47.4	+20.8
Nonwhite	10,794	5,253	5,541	105.5	100.0	100.0	
Central city	7,137	3,918	3,219	82.2	66.1	74.6	−8.5
Ring	3,658	1,335	2,323	174.0	33.9	25.4	+8.5
West:							
White	35,682	18,403	17,279	93.9	100.0	100.0	
Central city	9,388	7,990	1,398	17.5	26.3	43.4	−17.1
Ring	26,294	10,413	15,881	152.5	73.7	56.6	+17.1
Nonwhite	4,330	1,732	2,598	150.0	100.0	100.0	
Central city	2,859	1,190	1,669	140.3	66.0	68.7	−2.7
Ring	1,470	542	928	171.2	34.0	31.3	+2.7

[1] 1960 boundaries of SMSA's used for 1960; 1967 boundaries used for 1985.

Source: P. L. Hodge and P. M. Hauser; "The Challenge of America's Metropolitan Population Outlook—1960 to 1985," 1968, Research Report No. 3, U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C., p. 26.

The Family

As a Task Force, we are primarily concerned with the impoverished urban child in his role as a student. However, we fully recognize that unless the education system serving him has a clear grasp of the world in which he must live and survive and can accept this world without condescension, any educational programs which are designed and implemented can only be of limited effectiveness. We further recognize that, perhaps, no element has more direct and continuing emotional-social impact on any child than that of his family. Through its members, its values and needs, and its interactions, the family concomitantly constitutes and lays down the immediate dimensions of the impoverished urban child's world. In this sec-

tion, we describe what some of the major ones are and consider their significance for the urban education system. Therefore, the first part of this section deals with some general statistics on the family; the second, with the character of inner city family living. Much of what we say in both parts is admittedly negative, but we stress that the "negatives" are the results of a pernicious and insidious combination of economic poverty, discrimination, isolation, and sheer physical hardships. And we further stress that such negatives are *not* to be considered as intrinsic to the impoverished urban family.

The Family in General

It is important to point out at the beginning that within the Negro family structure as within the white family, there is great diversity and variation. And it is the similarities and differences so well documented in Andrew Billingsley's *Black Families in White America* that make it almost impossible to generalize about the structure of the Negro family.

In 1965, Moynihan made a report on the structure of Negro families. Using sources which included the U.S. Census of Population, 1960; Nonwhite Population by Race; and Vital Statistics of the U.S., he found that nearly one-fourth of urban Negro births are not illegitimate; nearly one-fourth of all Negro families are headed by a female. What is amazing, however, is that despite the economic and other pressures which the Negro family must face, 75 percent of urban Negro marriages remained intact, 75 percent of Negro births were legitimate, and 75 percent of all Negro families were headed by a male.

The situation as Moynihan found it in 1965 is not improving as illustrated by the following figures. The proportion of husband-wife families among blacks declined from 73 percent to 66 percent between 1960 and 1968. Table 23 shows the comparison of types of families by percent for race and location, i.e., central cities, suburban rings, and the metropolitan areas in general. As table 24 shows, a higher percentage of unrelated (not blood-related) males reside with black families (47 percent) than do white males with white families (36 percent) in the inner cities. One-fifth of all male unrelated individuals in the central cities are black. Approximately, the same percent exists for the suburban rings.

TABLE 23.—TYPES OF WHITE AND NONWHITE FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS—TYPE OF FAMILY

	Metropolitan areas, total			Central cities			Suburban rings		
	1968	1960	Percent change	1968	1960	Percent change	1968	1960	Percent change
TOTAL									
Number (millions)	32.2	28.6		14.6	14.7		17.6	13.9	
Percent	100	100		100	100		100	100	
Husband-wife	86	88	−2	82	84	−2	90	91	−1
Other male head	3	3	(1)	3	3	(1)	2	2	(1)
Female head	11	10	+1	15	12	+3	8	7	+1
WHITE									
Number (millions)	28.6	25.8		11.8	12.4		16.8	13.3	
Percent	100	100		100	100		100	100	
Husband-wife	88	89	−1	85	86	−1	90	92	−2
Other male head	2	3	−1	3	3	(1)	2	2	(1)
Female head	10	8	+2	12	10	+2	8	6	+2
NEGRO									
Number (millions)	3.3	2.6		2.6	2.1		.7	.5	
Percent	100	100		100	100		100	100	
Husband-wife	67	74	−7	66	73	−7	72	79	−7
Other male head	4	4	(1)	4	4	(1)	6	3	+3
Female head	29	22	+7	30	23	+7	22	18	+4

[1] No change.

Source: Bureau of the Census, "Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas," 1969, p. 12.

TABLE 24.—UNRELATED INDIVIDUALS BY SEX, 1968

[Numbers in millions]

	Total	Male	Female	Male as a percent of tota
Metropolitan areas (total)	9.2	3.4	5.8	37
White	7.9	2.8	5.1	35
Negro	1.2	.6	.7	47
Percent of total	13	17	11	(1)
Central cities (total)	5.7	2.2	3.6	38
White	4.7	1.7	3.0	36
Negro	1.0	.5	.5	47
Percent of total	17	21	15	(1)
Suburban rings (total)	3.5	1.3	2.2	36
White	3.2	1.1	2.1	35
Negro	.3	.1	.1	46
Percent of total	7	9	6	(1)

[1] Not applicable.

Source: Bureau of the Census, "Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas," 1969, p. 19.

TABLE 25—ILLEGITIMATE BIRTHS,[1] 1940-66

	Number (thousands)			Percent illegitimate of all live births		
	Nonwhite	White	Difference	Nonwhite	White	Difference
1940	49	40	9	16.8	2.0	14.8
1945	61	56	5	17.9	2.4	15.5
1950	88	54	34	18.0	1.8	16.2
1955	119	64	55	20.2	1.9	18.3
1960	142	83	59	21.6	2.3	19.3
1965	168	124	44	26.3	4.0	22.3
1966	170	133	37	27.7	4.4	23.3

[1] As stated in the source cited: "No estimates are included for misstatements on the birth record or for failure to register births. The decision to conceal the illegitimacy of births is likely conditioned by attitudes in the mother's social group toward her and toward children born out of wedlock. Also, the ability (economic or otherwise) to leave a community before the birth of the child is an important consideration. These factors probably result in proportionately greater understatement of illegitimacy in the white group than in the nonwhite."

Note: 34 States and the District of Columbia report legitimacy status on birth certificates. For the remaining States the illegitimacy ratio is estimated from the reporting States in each of the 9 geographic divisions. The following States do not report legitimacy: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Vermont, Georgia, and Montana. The last 2 States reported before 1957.

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education; and Welfare.

Already documented in the first and third sections of this chapter are, the higher mortality rates for non-white fathers, mothers, and children and the fact that the birth rate for non-white children is increasing. A fact not previously mentioned is that the number of illegitimate children born to black mothers has also increased. The latest data indicate that illegitimate births have been increasing for both black and white mothers. No reliable comparison of the difference between the rates for black and white mothers can be made for reasons stated in Table 25 which follows.

Non-whites have a substantially higher divorce rate than white inner city dwellers. The non-white male divorce rate is five times that of his white counterpart. The non-white female has a divorce rate six times that of *her white counterpart* (Douglass, 1966, p. 340). Moreover, there has been an increase in the non-white suicide rate. Although white suicide rates definitely exceed those of non-whites, the difference in recent years is decreasing (*U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics*, 1966, p. 225).

Already mentioned as an index of economic status, welfare support for impoverished urban families is often a fact of life. Concerning marital status, 37 percent of all Negro AFDC recipients were married; 54 percent of white recipients were married. Three times as many black were single, compared to whites. Approximately the same proportion of blacks as white recipients were characterized by home broken by marital discord (divorce, legally separated, and deserted) in 1961 (Polski and Brown, 1967, Tables 31–33b).

Previously mentioned have been the elements of health, nutrition, economic status, employment, and housing and living conditions—all of which add up to a massive constellation of elements and interactions working against the continuation of the impoverished urban family as a unit—let alone against its roles of providing stability and protection for its children. The truly remarkable fact is that in spite of all the problems for which these families must almost daily find resolutions, the majority of them still manage to function as intact and vital units in the inner city.

Character of Inner City Living

The character and quality of inner city living is difficult to fathom from sets of statistics which are highly abstracted statements of the effects of such living on the residents. Yet, it is with the character of life in the inner city that both its residents and the urban school must deal.

We have yet to develop an adequate quantitative measure for life style. Accordingly, this second part on the family is largely descriptive and anecdotal in its sampling of the evidence.

Minuchin, et al (1967), in an intensive study of six families of children at the Wiltwyck School, a private residential treatment center in New York, describes the families of the children with whom they worked:

"Their families are impoverished, disadvantaged, unstable, 'hard-core' families. They are mostly from minority ethnic backgrounds (Negro and Puerto Rican), and they dwell in the congested, rat-infested ghettos and slums of New York City. Such children and their families can be found in the big cities throughout our nation. We do not know how 'representative' the families we worked with are. But we do know that all such families have in common a difficult struggle for survival in our society. They are often 'multi-agency' families. In varying degrees they are known to the police, courts, welfare facilities, shelter agencies, clinics, hospitals, social agencies, visiting nurse associations, truant officers, parole officers, and other private, city, and state institutions. And yet they are anonymous. For although they are in constant contact with the institutional representatives of society, they remain shadowy;

they feel left out of the main stream, as indeed they are."

With regard to one of the six families studied, the following account of the quality of the world this family lives in is given:

"Strangers, neighbors, 'cops,' schoolmates, friends, and relatives move through this world, and so do the shadowy, transient lovers of some of these people. There are money and adventures to be taken and victims to be 'took.' There is action: the excitement or the chase of the being chased. There are risks. The world is people by adults who can be counted on and adults whom you cannot trust." (Minuchin, et al, 1967, p. 127).

In one of a collection of papers, pertaining to the disadvantaged child (Frost and Hawkes 1966), Jules Henry noted the below-noted qualities and characteristics:

" 'Among the children of the very poor, survival must take precedence over every other consideration.' Where the fight for survival involves the full energies of the child, how can he find the time and the strength to develop the values espoused by his society, such as pride in work, reward for effort, consideration of other people, and courage in meeting life's problems?" (page 377)

* * * * *

"Where no father is present during the evening, there is usually no organized meal, no organized opportunity for language exchange, no real interaction. A common result is cumulative deficit in the language component of a child's development. Since this deficit is qualitative and quantitative, it is erroneous to believe these children are characteristically nonverbal." (Henry in Frost and Hawkes, 1966, pp. 377, 380).

Reissman (1962) also presents information on the character of inner city living.

"The key to much of the family life is security and protection. The large extended family[21] provides a small world in which one is accepted and same. If help is needed, the family is the court of first resort and will provide it, at least to some extent. Time and energy, rather than money, are the chief resources provided.

* * * * *

"The home is a crowded, busy, active, noisy place where no one child is focused upon. There are too many children for this, and the parents have too little time. Consequently, the children spend much more time in each other's company and with the relatives. Individualism and self-concern on the part of the children is much less likely to emerge and is, in fact, discouraged in this more family-centered home.

"Intense parent-child relationships are infrequent, and while the danger of parental rejection is present, overprotection is out of the question.

"The atmosphere is much more communal and, to some extent, cooperative." (Reissman, 1962, pp. 36–37).

A characteristic of much concern to educators and psychologists has been the considerable use of punishment or discipline. As the following statements bring out, it is likely that school personnel are not placing most forms of punishment (excepting extreme forms, of course) in their proper perspective for these families.

"Since physical punishment is part of the everyday pattern among the disadvantaged, there is probably considerable adaptation to it and it is not perceived as a major threat to the ego; as physical punishment and aggression generally are expressed rather easily and directly, it is unlikely that they have the sadistic overtones that often produce the negative correlates of punishment.

* * * * *

"Why do underprivileged parents use punishment so freely? This practice is frequently intepreted as restrictive and unloving. However, wtih the peculiar problems that plague their lives, with large families often crowded into small apartments, and with both working, the problem of discipline becomes a difficult one. Popularly held notions of permissiveness cannot easily be applied. Respect and obedience without a lot of arguing and 'reasoning' is probably much more convenient when the parents come home tired from a hard day's work. They are in no mood to cajole the children and they resort much more quickly to physical punishment—not sadistic beatings, but a quick slap and a strong tone.

"Underprivileged people do not see discipline as inconsistent with love; that is, they do not feel when they punish a child that this might indicate a lack of love for him." (Reissman, 1962, pp. 39–40).

There are several additional qualities which make up the character of inner city living which are all-too-often lost in the enumeration of negative characteristics. It is fitting that this section end with a statement of these qualities. On the "positive" side are:

"The cooperativeness and mutual aid that mark the extended family; avoidance of the strain accompanying competitiveness and individualism; equalitarianism, informality, and warm humor; freedom of self-blame and parental over-protection; the children's enjoyment of each other's company, and lessened sibling rivalry; the security found in the extended family and in a traditional outlook." (Reissman, 1962, p. 48).

Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, we have considered the environment of the impoverished urban student in terms of its impact, its offerings, and its differences. Although not exhaustively, we have presented information concerning a set of elements which we consider are basic in this student's world, and which, in combination have a major influence on how he will both perceive and perform in the school.

Most of the conclusions which we draw from the evidence presented are extremely disturbing. If there is such a thing as the American dream, it is far from being realized for the impoverished urban student. It is no wonder that Martin Luther King, Jr., said, "I have a dream." For this student in the fall of 1969, it could hardly be otherwise . . .

Our specific conclusions concerning the urban student and his environment are, as follows:

1. He and his family are apt to live on a diet which is less than adequate—if not insufficient. And he is less likely to manifest adequate health and energy levels for a sustained effort on demanding tasks, e.g., reading as taught by the school. He may not appear as able as other students his age due in part to this prolonged malnourishment.

2. He lives in a world in which the mortality rates of women and babies in birth are higher and the life expectancies of men are lower than for other Americans.

3. Economically, he lives in a world in which unemployment, underemployment, and the inadequate welfare check are common facts of life. He learns, too, as his family already has, that his family's economic status is all too often a direct offshoot of racial discrimination. For even if he does finish high school or college, he will earn less than his white counterpart with the same years of schooling.

4. He lives in housing which is apt to be in poor condition—if it isn't classified as substandard, and it may very likely be overcrowded.

5. His family will probably pay more for this housing than it's worth simply because there is really nowhere else to go. A new home or a better apartment would be out of the question on his family's income—quite apart from the discrimination barrier.

6. Within his immediate experience, if not directly within his family, there may be problems resulting from divorce, separation, or desertion by one or the other of his parents. And, although only touched upon peripherally or implied, he will probably gain a knowledge of the problems associated with drug addiction, prostitution, and theft within his neighborhood—if not within his immediate family.

7. Within this family—and particularly if it is an extended family—he will develop a tough self-reliance, learn to cooperate, probably receive a prompt reaction in terms of physical discipline for stepping out of line, tolerate a high degree of noise, and experience considerable casualness in terms of daily routine.

8. The concepts, language, and problem solving techniques he acquires will be primarily geared to his survival in the neighborhood and the necessary interactions in and demands of his family.

It is our contention that all of these elements and their interactions which characterize the impoverished urban environment and which are inevitably reflected to various degrees in any one student from it are directly contributing to making the task of urban education a unique one. Moreover, when we consider the increasing rise in the urban population of young children and teenagers, the task now facing urban education becomes not only unique but monumental as well. Finally, we do not find that many changes for the better have occurred in this environment since the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders sounded its lucid and comprehensive warnings to the nation at large. Although our data are much more limited, they clearly suggest that we have precious little time in which to make needed—and orderly—changes in the urban environment.

Chapter IV takes up a major element in this environment, the urban education system.

Chapter IV. The urban education system

The preceding two chapters have documented the financial and environmental sets of factors contributing to the urban educational problem. Such financial deficiencies and conditions dominating the urban student's world are prime contributors, along with legislative obstacles at all governmental levels, to the urban education problem. Without such a complex of debilitating conditions, perhaps most urban education systems could achieve success where relatively few now do despite such hurdles. Yet, in the face of so many obstacles, all too few systems attempt to or know how to wage a battle geared to effectively overcome them. And in too many systems, there are aspects of that system (which are themselves an important contributor to the problem) such as remoteness of its administration from its constituencies; patronizing attitudes; inexperienced, unimaginative, and inappropriately trained teachers.

In this chapter, we shall discuss the indicators of the extent to which the system itself has a responsibility for the general lack of success in urban education. Although it is impossible to isolate the effects upon the system of all the obstacles facing urban education today, this chapter will: (1) identify those obstacles extrinsic to the system beyond those of finance (Chapter II) and environment (Chapter III), such as the in- and out-migration patterns; (2) proceed to identify those areas in which the system itself is failing in full or partial degree, such as in the accuracy and sensitivity of its perceptions of the students; and (3) discuss those indicators of the system's lack of success as manifested in the perceptions and expressions of its constituents, i.e., the students, the teachers, and the community. Accordingly, the chapter is organized into three major sections, followed by a summary.

It should be noted that this presentation is not just intended to blame urban education

---

Footnotes at end of article.

systems, but rather to analyze those indicators of a failure for which the system has considerable responsibility. We recognize that as difficulties in school systems have been given wider and wider coverage, targets of blame become fashionable for a period of time which are to some extent discarded only when a new target undergoes scrutiny. In recent years, such targets are many. Initially, the family of the child—or the child himself—was charged with his lack of achievement. The second target was the superintendent, followed by the school board, the principal, and the teacher. As such overly simplified attacks have been made, little attention has been given to the conflicting Federal, State, and local laws and the discrepancies between authorizations and appropriations which serve as the backdrop against which school people must work out their programs—and their frustrations. With a backdrop of these obstacles in mind, this chapter will analyze the role of the system in an attempt to document those failures which are specifically its own responsibility.[22]

Obstacles faced by urban education systems

The movement of high tax-paying business and salaried professional populations out of the cities, compounded by the entrance of large numbers of disadvantaged, have, as we have noted in Chapter 2, caused significant economic problems for the cities and for the education systems of the cities. This section will define and document the extent of this in- and out-migration and discuss the impact of such migration on areas of vital concern to the education system, particularly those of facilities and personnel.

Extent of In- and Out-Migration

As racial and ethnic minorities flow into the cities, their numbers, their poverty, their social isolation, their lack of education, and their needs and problems which are dissimilar to their predecessors', are of direct concern to the educational system. While the system has been able to count their numbers and to measure the indicators of their poverty, social isolation and lack of education, it has, in many cases failed to respond to—or even to recognize—their needs and problems. The impact and extent of the migration is as follows:

Numbers.—During the post-World War II period, millions of blacks left the rural South to seek better conditions in urban centers. The greatest Southern exodus occurred during the 1940's and 1950's, but even in 1968 the average annual non-white migration from the South was 80,000 (See Table 1). As shown in Table 2, in 1960, Negroes comprised 11 percent of the population of all metropolitan areas and in 1968, 12 percent. In the inner city, the concentration is greater in density. Today, blacks comprise about 20 percent of the total inner city population as compared with 12 percent in 1950. In cities with 1,000,000 or more inhabitants, blacks make up an inner city population today of 25 percent as compared to 13 percent in 1950. From 1960 to 1965, the Negro population in the central cities was up by 2,100,000 and the white population was down by 270,000. In the suburbs the figures are strikingly different. From 1960 to 1965, the suburban Negro population increased by 400,000 while the white population increased by 7,000,000 (*U.S. News and World Report*, 3/19/67, p. 61). The Spanish-speaking population has also become urbanized. Representing approximately 5 percent of the general population, 82 percent of the Spanish-speaking population resides in an urban environment (Moore & Mittelbach, 1966, pp. vi-vii).

TABLE 1.—NEGRO POPULATION AND ESTIMATED NET OUTMIGRATION OF NONWHITES FROM THE SOUTH,[1] 1940-68

[In thousands]

	1940	1950	1960	1965	1968
Negro population in the South	9,905	10,222	11,312	[2] 11,233	[2] 11,573
	1940-50	1950-60	1960-65		1965-68
Nonwhite, average annual net outmigration from the South	195.7	145.7	94.6		80.3

[1] The South includes the States of the Old Confederacy as well as Delaware, the District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland Oklahoma, and West Virginia.
[2] Excludes Armed Forces living in barracks.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Recent Trends in Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United State, July 1968, p. 2.

TABLE 2.—POPULATION CHANGE BY LOCATION, INSIDE AND OUTSIDE METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1950-68

[Numbers in millions]

	Total population						Population change 1950-68					
	Negro			White			Negro			White		
	1960	1966	1968	1960	1966	1968	1950-60	1960-66	1966-68	1950-60	1960-66	1966-68
United States	18.8	21.5	21.9	158.1	170.9	173.7	+3.8	+2.6	+.4	+23.7	+12.8	+2.8
Metropolitan areas	12.2	14.8	15.0	99.2	109.3	110.7	+3.8	+2.6	+.2	+19.3	+10.2	+1.3
Central areas	9.7	12.1	11.8	47.5	46.6	45.8	+3.2	+2.4	−.2	+2.2	−.8	−.8
Suburbs [1]	2.5	2.7	3.2	51.7	62.7	64.9	+.6	+.2	+.4	+17.2	+11.0	+2.2
maller cities, towns and rural	6.7	6.7	7.0	58.9	61.6	63.0	([2])	([2])	+.2	+4.3	+2.7	+1.5

[1] Comprises the part of metropolitan area outside central cities.
[2] Less than 50,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Recent Trends in Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States," July 1968, p. 4.

In the inner city, the non-whites who are moving in and those who are already there are younger and have a higher birth rate than those whites remaining. In 1960, 35 percent of the black population was under 18 years of age and 65 percent was over 18 years of age. In 1967, 44.7 percent was under 18; and 55.3 percent was over 18 years of age.

The number of non-white teenagers has increased over 50 percent from 1960 to 1966. This figure is almost double the national teenage growth rate. Non-whites under 14 years of age increased at an average annual rate three times that of white children. Ninety-five percent of this increase is in the inner cities (Louria & Stokes, 1968, p. 1) where schools are now confronted with the urgent problems of low reading and arithmetic achievement and poor social interaction.

Poverty.—As shown in Chapter 2, "Financial Crisis," more families with incomes under $3,000 live in the city than in the suburbs—and the number is ever increasing. Chapter 3 provides further documentation.

Social isolation.—As the Commission on Civil Disorders cautioned, we are moving closer and closer "toward two societies; one black, one white—separate and unequal" (Kerner, et al. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1969, p. 1). The poor, maleducated non-white remains in the city while the affluent white rushes to the suburbs. The black and Spanish-speaking groups comprise a far higher percent of the inner cities' population than they do of the country's total population. In the public schools of such cities, the pupil enrollment is largely black and Spanish-speaking while the non-public schools are largely white. At the same time the educational systems are attempting to deal with the *de facto* school segregation inherent in a residential segregated setting. Thirteen of the nation's 20 largest cities with populations in excess of 500,000 approach the Tauber Index of 100, signifying total residential segregation (See Table 3). Unless there are some major governmental policy changes, these 20 cities, which account for approximately half of the black population of the country, will be uniformly characterized by extreme residential, and therefore extreme *de facto* segregation. All evidence indicates that the trend is continuing, albeit slowing down.

The most recent data suggest that 70 percent of all black pupils attend schools that are composed of 90 to 100 percent black pupils. By 1975, probably 80 percent of all black students in the above 20 cities will be attending 90 to 100 percent black schools. Except for Washington, D.C., the cities showing the least segregation are located in the West. The rate of Negro in-migration, however, is likely soon to move West into the same orbit as the South and Northeast. What is more, Houston and Dallas are only now moving from *de jure* to *de facto* school segregation.[23]

The lack of education.—While the inner city is becoming more non-white than white, it is also becoming increasingly less educated.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 3.—POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS, MIGRATION, AND SEGREGATION PATTERNS IN 20 LARGE CITIES [1]

City	1960 SMSA population	1960 city population	1960 city nonwhite population	1960 city nonwhite percent	1964 estimate SMSA population	1960–64 estimate change in migration	1960 city residential segregation index [2]	1950–60 change in segregation pattern	1960 suburban residential segregation index [3]
New York	10,695,000	7,781,984	1,141,322	14.7	11,260,000	115,000	79.3	−8.0	[4] 77.5
Chicago	6,221,000	3,550,404	837,656	23.6	6,591,000	3,000	92.6	.5	88.7
Los Angeles	6,039,000	2,479,015	417,207	16.8	6,674,000	286,000	81.8	−2.8	[4] 83.7
Philadelphia	4,343,000	2,002,512	535,033	26.7	4,617,000	56,000	87.1	−1.9	[4] 82.0
Detroit	3,762,000	1,670,144	487,174	29.2	3,914,000	−80,000	84.5	−4.3	[4] 87.6
Baltimore	1,727,000	939,024	328,416	35.0	1,829,000	(5)	89.6	−1.7	80.9
Houston	1,418,000	938,219	217,672	23.2	1,640,000	108,000	93.7	2.2	
Cleveland	1,909,000	876,050	253,108	28.9	1,958,000	−51,000	91.3	−.2	
Washington	2,002,000	763,956	418,693	54.8	2,323,000	173,000	79.7	−.4	87.8
St. Louis	2,105,000	750,026	216,022	28.8	2,203,000	−24,000	90.5	−2.4	90.3
Milwaukee	1,233,000	741,324	65,752	8.9	1,262,000	−50,000	88.1	−3.5	
San Francisco	2,649,000	740,316	135,913	18.4	2,894,000	107,000	69.3	−10.5	[4] 79.7
Boston	2,595,000	697,197	68,493	9.8	3,177,000	−81,000	83.9	−2.6	65.5
Dallas	1,084,000	679,684	131,211	19.3	1,256,000	89,000	94.6	6.2	
New Orleans	907,000	627,525	234,931	37.4	1,001,000	32,000	86.3	1.4	
Pittsburgh	2,405,000	604,332	101,739	16.8	2,368,000	−132,000	84.6	.6	
San Antonio	716,000	587,718	43,221	7.4	787,000	8,000	90.1	1.8	
San Diego	1,033,000	573,224	44,712	7.8	1,131,000	19,000	81.3	−2.3	
Seattle	1,107,000	557,087	46,528	8.4	1,178,000	9,000	79.7	−3.6	
Buffalo	1,307,000	532,759	73,388	13.8	1,319,000	−54,000	86.5	−3.0	82.3

[1] This table was constructed for a paper prepared by Robert A. Dentler and James W. Elsbery for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 1967.
[2] Adapted from the Tauber's Racial Segregation Index, Negroes in Cities, tables 1 and 12, pp 32–33, 59.
[3] Where more than 1 suburb is clustered about a city an average segregation index is calculated.
[4] Less than 500 or 0.05.

The inner city's Negro median number of years of completed schooling was 9 in 1967, compared to 12.1 for whites (Census, 1968, Table 156).[24]

Impact of In- and Out- Migration on the System.—As a result of the above factors,, schools are facing a near paralysis in both dealing with the sheer numbers and in attempting to integrate the isolated groups. With the 40 percent non-white population, the higher non-white birthrate, and with many whites sending their children to parochial and private schools, the majority of students in the public schools would necessarily become increasingly non-white—thus creating additional problems in efforts to integrate. The growing population has only increased the inadequacy of school facilities. It has made the existing teacher shortage more acute. The following two sections will discuss these obstacles faced by overpopulated urban school systems.

Increased Inadequacy of Facilities

The Kerner Commission (1968) pointed out that because of the rapid expansion of the Negro population which "has been concentrated in segregated neighborhoods, ghetto schools have experienced acute overcrowding. Shortages of textbooks and supplies have developed. Double shifts are common; hallways and other non-classroom space have been adapted for class instruction, and mobile classroom units are used. Even programs for passive construction of new schools in Negro neighborhoods cannot always keep up with increased overcrowding." (Kerner, et al. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968, p. 432).

Difficulties with facilities result not only from increased population but are also combined with the age of such facilities. This combination presents a bleak picture in the inner cities when compared to the suburbs. Core schools generally have more impoverished or makeshift instruction rooms per building than do fringe schools. A greater percentage of core students than suburban students attend school buildings which are older and larger, with more students in the school, more students per teacher, and more students per room. For instance, in the Northeast, 43 percent of the elementary core schools are over 40 years old, while in the fringe schools, only 18 percent are over age 40. Figures are comparable for secondary schools. In secondary education, there are seven more students per classroom in the core than in the fringe in the Northeast. In the Midwest, there are 21 more students per classroom (Coleman, 1966, pp. 68, 69, 71). In addition, there are fewer librarians attending to the core schools with a centralized library, fewer volumes in the core school library, and fewer volumes per core school student (Coleman, 1966, p. 74). Further, there is definite advantage in the suburban schools in facilities for preparing hot meals and for providing health services (Coleman, 1966, p. 71).

Increased Personnel Problems [25]

In its study of the problems and priorities of urban education, the Study Group on Urban Education of the Republican Coordinating Committee draws the following conclusion about the quality of teaching in our urban areas:

"The teacher is a fundamental and crucial link between the education system and the child. A child is under the influence of his teacher for a continuous period of five hours or more per day, 180 days or more per year. . . . It is apparent that success or failure of an education system will depend most vitally upon the quality of teaching. Yet in urban areas today, because of numerous difficulties, the quality of teaching and the pupil-teacher relationship frequently do not meet the needs of the disadvantaged child." (Republican Coordinating Committee, Study Group on Urban Eduction as cited by the Center for Urban Education).

These difficulties become abundantly clear from the following data.

Teacher shortages.—Significant numbers of large city school systems reported that they were encountering extreme difficulty in filling teaching positions for 1968–69. The most frequently identified assignments these school systems report having extreme difficulty in filling and the number of unfilled positions in early August are shown in Table 4. Supporting these reports of shortages are the relatively large numbers of these school systems which report they have had to employ persons with substandard qualifications in these assignment areas for 1968–69: 21, industrial arts; 27, special education; 15, mathematics; 11, trade-industrial-vocational-technical courses; 17, regular instruction in elementary grades; 7 natural and physical science; and 6, women teachers of physical and health education.

It is interesting to note the relatively small number of teachers for the educationally disadvantaged citied in these figures. It would seem that the shortages referred to above are those in special programs for the disadvantaged, but the need for more qualified teachers for inner-city schools exists in virtually all of the shortage areas cited.

TABLE 4.—SURVEY OF DIFFICULT-TO-FILL POSITIONS IN LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

ASSIGNMENT	Number of school systems reporting having extreme difficulty in filling position	Number of positions not filled in August in the large school systems
Industrial arts	45	284
Special education	32	867
Mathematics	27	382
Trade, industrial, vocational	20	89
School psychologists	15	91
Physical education (women)	13	180
Remedial reading speech, etc	13	153
Librarians	11	124
Elementary, regular instruction	10	2,123
Natural and physical sciences	10	193
Instruction of educationally disadvantaged	10	148

Source: Center for Urban Education.

Looking to the staffing problems of the cities selected for study in connection with this report, it can be noted that in Washington, D.C. over the period of 1966-1968 pupil population increased from 145,951 to 148,719, a gain of 1.9 percent. During the same period the teacher population decreased from 6,391 to 5,958, a loss of 6.3 percent. The pupil teacher ratio was thus raised from 23 : 1 to 25 : 1. A similar inverse relationship was observable in Los Angeles. Pupil population for the same period increased 2.8 percent while teacher population decreased by almost 1 percent. This change increased the pupil-teacher ratio from already high 29:1 to 30:1 (pupil-teacher ratio average for all schools in the United States is 23 : 1). Milwaukee showed a pupil population increase of 2.1 percent and a teacher population decrease of 1.9 percent, with a rise in pupil-teacher ratio from 26:1 to 27:1. While not displaying inverse pupil-teacher population development, the cities of Chicago and Philadelphia both reveal a significantly greater rate of increase in pupil population than teacher population growth could keep pace with. Pupil population in Chicago showed an increase of 4.1 percent and an increase in teacher population of only 2.7 percent. Philadelphia's pupil body expanded by 5.3 percent, compared to its teaching staff growth of 4.4 per-

Footnotes at end of article.

cent. Pupil-teacher ratio was then observed to increase in Chicago from 24.5 : 1 to 26.2 : 1 and in Philadelphia from 23.8 : 1 to 24.0 : 1.

High pupil-teacher ratio.—Taking pupil-teacher ratio as an index of instructional staff supply problems in urban areas, a fall 1968 survey revealed that eight of the twelve cities under study in this document exceeded the national average pupil-teacher ratio of 23.1 by as much as 5.1 more pupils per teacher. The range of excess was from 5 to 5.1 (See Table 5).

Lack of fully accredited teachers.—Among the many staffing difficulties experienced by big city school systems, the short supply of fully accredited or licensed teachers remains a vexing problem. This is clear from the following comparison. The total number of full time teachers with less than standard certificates in the United States reported in a fall 1968 survey was 108,000, this figure representing 5.6 percent of all employed full time teachers. At the same time, cities such as Chicago, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C. reported much higher percentages of classroom teachers with less than standard certificates, i.e., Chicago 33.9 percent, Baltimore 23.8 percent and Washington, D.C. 26.0 percent.

TABLE 5.—PUPIL-TEACHER RATIOS IN 8 LARGE CITIES

	Pupil-teacher ratio	No. of pupils over national average
City:		
Baltimore	23.6	0.5
Chicago	24.5	1.4
Cleveland	27.0	3.8
Houston	26.9	3.8
Los Angeles	26.5	3.4
Milwaukee	27.5	4.4
Philadelphia	24.7	1.6
St. Louis	28.2	5.1

Source: Center for Urban Education.

Comparison between cities and suburbs.—The straits of big cities regarding the supply of educational personnel is further illustrated by comparisons drawn between several of the cities under consideration and their surrounding suburbs and towns. Striking differences favoring the suburbs are evidenced regarding the supply of school nurses, school librarians, and school psychologists. For example, Washington, D.C. reveals a ratio of 1,377 pupils per school librarian, in sharp contrast to that of neighboring Arlington County, Virginia which presents a ratio of only 459 pupils per librarian. Similar contrasts are to be found when comparisons are made between Baltimore and Baltimore County (2,317:1 and 787:1 respectively); Cleveland and Cleveland Heights (1,365:1 and 802:1 respectively); Philadelphia and Bristol Township (6,287:1 and 1,446:1 respectively); Milwaukee and Racine (10,508:1 and 1,432:1 respectively); San Francisco and Berkeley (1,958:1 and 750:1 respectively); Los Angeles and Long Beach (26,354:1 and 1,138:1 respectively). A comparison of some of the same cities and nearby *suburbs regarding school nurses and school* psychologists reveals yet another staffing disadvantage of big city school systems. In Washington, D.C., there is a ratio of 3,105 pupils per school nurse, while in Arlington County, Virginia, one finds a ratio of 1,540 per school nurse. Again, similar contrasts are to be found when comparisons are made between Philadelphia and Bristol Township (1,172:1 and 732:1 respectively); and between Chicago and Rockford (4,034:1 and 1,589:1 respectively). Likewise, in the matter of school psychologist, striking contrasts are found between Washington, D.C. and Arlington County, Virginia (6,346:1 and 3,273:1 respectively); and between San Francisco and Haywood (9,400:1 and 4,308:1 respectively).

Racial distribution of teaching staffs.—The problems of big city schools will not be completely solved if more minority group teachers and administrators are recruited and promoted, but unless they are, all other reforms seem hypocritical. Unless prejudice and racism are overcome, all other programs will fall short of their goals. Moreover, quite apart from moral exhortations, it is clear that minority group teachers represent an under-utilized manpower pool which might substantially contribute to the reduction of the shortage mentioned above. The results of generations of discriminatory hiring and promotion practices are revealed in one of the findings of the Coleman Report: "Compared to the teachers of the average white pupil, the teacher of the average Negro pupil is . . . much more likely to be Negro in every region." A 1963 study of Cleveland's East Side, for example, showed that 81 percent of the teachers assigned to nearly-all Negro schools were Negro, 91 percent of the teachers in majority-Negro schools were Negro, and 3 percent of the teachers in nearly-all white schools were Negro. That the process of changing these racial patterns is far from complete may be exemplified by illustrations from a number of schol systems. In Los Angeles (Fall 1967), for example, where 21.4 percent of the pupils are black, only 6.1 percent of the administrators, 12.8 percent of the counselors, and 14.7 percent of the teachers are black. Even more striking 20.3 percent of the pupils have Spanish surnames, but only 1.3 percent of the administrators and 3.0 percent of the teachers have Spanish surnames. In Chicago, where approximately 54 percent (1966) of the student body is black, 33.9 percent of the teaching staff is black and approximately 21.9 percent of the administrative supervisory staff and specially assigned teachers are black. The situation in New York City schools is even more acute. Only 6,000 (11 percent) of a 55,000 teaching force is black. The proportion of black administrators is even lower.

Teacher drop-out.—The perennial and increasing problem of staffing big city schools is aggravated by a phenomenon identified by B. Othanel Smith and his associates as the "Teacher Dropout." And this attrition problem among new teachers and teachers at all levels of experience seems greater in the inner-city regions of big cities. It has been noted for example that the rate of exit from Chicago inner-city schools is ten times that of less poverty-stricken areas. Citing Haubrich and others, Smith offers a useful summary of current information concerning the high rate of teacher exit from inner city schools.

In the borough of Manhattan, according to Haubrich, one third of the teachers appointed to positions do not accept their assignments. Moreover, in a study of teacher attitudes in 15 major American cities, it was reported that 17 percent of the teachers had been in their ghetto school for one year and 63 percent in their present position for five years or less. The proportion of teachers remaining after five years dropped off radically. At the same time, some 88 percent of the *teachers indicated* that they were satisfied with their positions. But the rate of dropouts from the ghetto schools would seem to indicate that the teachers tend to move on even though they may express satisfaction with the school in general.

The teachers in the above-mentioned study were least satisfied with the working conditions, their teaching loads, and the community. About 63 percent were satisfied with their working conditions and approximately 62 percent with their teaeching loads. But only 58 percent expressed satisfaction with the community, with 48 percent of these being only somewhat satisfied. A large proportion of the teachers were satisfied with their colleagues, supervisors, the pupils, and with their salaries and the flexibility permitted them in the classroom. These findings seem to indicate that the dissatisfaction of within the school itself. Since teachers seem not to prefer neighborhoods where working conditions are unfavorable, young and inexperienced teachers, who must accept positions wherever they find them, are often located in the disadvantaged areas. With the highest rate of turnover among beginning teachers, it is not surprising that schools in deprived communities suffer a high rate of attrition among their teachers.

The Problems of the Education System in Perceiving Its Students

This section argues the inability, in many cases, of the system to cope with a pluralistic culture, and cites some of the reasons for the problems which many teachers have in perceiving their students as they are—and as they can be—and to respond to their needs.

Perhaps one of the most serious problems with many urban systems today is their lack of awareness of the effects of their own biases on their students. The racial and ethnic minorities, the urban immigrants of today, possess essentially the same general goals as those of the nationality immigrants of yesterday. Among these goals are the attainment of self-respect, personal safety, economic security, and acceptance in the mainstream without loss of individual self-identity. Despite the similarity in goals, today's minorities are separated from previous groups by more than years alone. The school systems which expected middle class performance from those earlier immigrants were fulfilled in their expectations for they were similar to those of the students.

The populations have changed; their strengths and weaknesses have changed; their problems have changed; their needs have changed; their values have changed. Most systems have not. Many systems' unconscious biases and static expectations have limited its capacity to teach children who enter the schools without certain attributes held by previous constituencies of the system. Such attributes relate to being oriented to middle class values and expectations, being reading-ready, and having the structural orientation that facilitates sifting from subject matter to subject matter as dictated by time blocs rather than by interest and substance. Because of the widespread use of systems' equating a student's capacity to meet their expectations with his possession of such middle class attributes, the concept of the self-fulfilling prophecy has all too often been demonstrated. "Children who are treated as if they are uneducable invariably become uneducable" (Clark, 1965, p. 128).

Studies indicate that a student entering the school doors has a significantly better chance if he is neither black nor nonwhite.[3] However, scattered throughout urban education systems are a growing number of activities which reflect efforts to overcome these biases—and, are, indeed, hopeful indicators. These efforts reflect a very considerable variety and scope. Among them are: decentralization and *de facto* community involvement in real decision-making, sensitivity training for school personnel; addition of courses in institutions of higher education on impoverished children and youth at the request of local educational systems; early childhood programs which are aimed at parents as well as their children; bilingual programs with emphasis on the cultural as well the linguistic aspects of language; job training in the high schools; and the like.

The Problem of the Teacher in Perceiving His Students

The teacher's problem in perceiving his students when those students represent backgrounds and values different from his own has complex origins. In addition to personal difficulties on the part of the teacher to accept and respect differences, there is the

Footnotes at end of article.

education system's—and indeed society's—lack of interest in so doing. Until quite recently, society generally, and teacher education institutions specifically, have attached little status to working with disadvantaged. One of the rewards of education has been presented as increased status in the eyes of society for those who have successfully negotiated the educational system from the primary years through graduate school. For the teacher, this status comes as a result of successful achievement at an institution of teacher training. His continued status often rests on his "ability" to teach only those students who are already successfully negotiating the system.

Graduate schools of education, with very few exceptions, have sent their brightest interns to wealthy suburban areas as their "reward," further reinforcing the notion that "good teachers deserve to teach in the suburbs, while less capable teachers are left to teach in the city." Implicit in this pattern of assignments is the corollary that suburban schools are "good" while city schools are "bad." The trend has been that graduates and younger, brighter graduate students have started their careers in suburban systems. Moreover, the most effective experienced teachers have generally selected suburban teaching settings. Thus, the least experienced teachers have been relegated to the cities, further reinforcing the view of the ghetto schools as inferior (Kerner, et al. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968, pp. 428–429).

The average Negro student is more likely than the suburban student to be taught by a teacher who: (1) scored slightly lower on a verbal examination voluntarily taken for the Coleman Report; and (2) attended a college which gives less than a regular teaching certificate (Coleman, et al., 1966, pp. 134, 137, 140).

"The schools attended by disadvantaged Negro children commonly are staffed by teachers with less experience and lower qualifications than those attended by middle-class whites. For example, a 1963 study ranking Chicago's public high schools by the socioeconomic status of surrounding neighborhoods found that in the ten lowest-ranking schools only 63.2 percent of all teachers were fully certified and the median level of all teaching experience was 3.9 years. In three of these schools the median level was one year. Four of these lowest ranking schools were 100 percent Negro enrollment and three were over 90 percent Negro. By contrast, eight of the ten highest ranking schools had nearly total white enrollments, and the other two were more than 75 percent white. In these schools, 99.3 percent of the teachers were fully certified and the median level of teaching experience was 12.3 years." (Kerner, et al., 1968, p. 428).

Thus, all too often those teachers who are either less successful in their own educations or who are least experienced face students with deep-seated differences, problems and needs which they little understand.

Where the teacher is far from his students in terms of their background and culture, and is conscious of his own lack of status as awarded by society for teaching the disadvantaged, the teacher is inclined to develop a set of defenses which distort his perceptions of his students. Such cultural pluralism compounded by the great size and density of population produces a growing schism based on mutual misperception and mistrust between many of the service professions, including teaching, and the urban impoverished groups. As sociologist, Dan Dodson was quoted:

"As schools now perform the status ordering, those who come out ahead have little sense of responsibility for those who are of less status. This is amply illustrated by the alienation which accompanies professional training. By the time a man is trained to be a doctor, he cannot treat the poor, except as they conform to his rituals. He has been tuned out of humanity's main wave lengths. By the time a man has become a lawyer, he has little concern with the poor, except to defend those with privilege against them. On the lower East Side, it was found that of 100 cases where people had been denied public welfare, 80 would have been eligible had they been represented with legal counsel. What strange value is this in American education which makes it impossible for those who are party to its blessings, to relate to the common stream of humanity? The doctors can't treat the poor. The lawyers can't serve them . . . the teachers can't teach them—they too have to be siphoned off into a special class. . . Education has become a stairway to status rather than a gateway to service." (Dodson, 1969, p. 19).

In too many cases, teachers cannot descend this stairway to more clearly and humanly see their students. We are fortunate in that there are always some teachers who do, indeed, see education as a "gateway to service." Despite often inappropriate materials, overcrowded classrooms, inadequate special services, and little special equipment, these teachers somehow still manage to carry on a classroom learning program which is appropriate for and effective with their students. And such teachers stay enthusiastic about what they and their students are achieving. But such teachers are in short supply.

The Problems With the System as a Perception of Its Students, Its Faculty, Its Community

Apart from and transcending that which can be measured, the system has major problems if its constituency thinks it is failing. To what extent and with what intensity that constituency believes the system has failed is impossible to measure with full accuracy, but there are certain indices by which the manifestations of that belief may be measured and, as a result, validated.

This section reinforces the student's perception of the system's failure through the documentation of achievement levels, drop-out rates, and instances of violence; the teacher's perception as articulated through strikes, disagreements, and a growing body of dissent literature; the community's perception as expressed by the defeat of bond issues, general lack of support and confidence, and a growing trend toward decentralization and separatism.

The System as Perceived by the Student

For the student, his belief that the system has failed is manifested by his lack of opportunity to achieve success within its framework by this judgment that something outside the system holds more relevance for him than anything within, or by his hostility toward it. The validity of these attitudes may be documented through the indices of student achievement, drop-out rates, and acts of vandalism or other forms of hostility toward the system.

Academic achievement of the inner-city student.—The system has failed—not only in the eyes of the student, but in fact—to provide the inner city student with the necessary level of achievement in academic skills. It has failed the disadvantaged student and the student of a racial or ethnic minority. In a detailed examination of urban education led by Congressman Alphonzo Bell and released by ten other members of the House of Representatives, one conclusion was:

"Each student in America should be given the opportunity to acquire the basic tools of speech, writing, reading, and math, without which he can neither learn further nor compete effectively. The core city youth, especially the ghetto Negro is not now acquiring these skills and we believe that urban education is inadequate to provide him the opportunity to acquire them." (*Congressional Record*, 8/19/68).

The evidence backs up such a conclusion. It is true, as mentioned above, that a student entering school has a significantly better chance if he is neither black nor non-white to achieve success in academic terms. Achievement scores on standardized examinations demonstrate conclusively that metropolitan Negro students score consistently lower than metropolitan white students—at every grade level and in relation to all basic skills. Data from the Coleman Report show for example, that in the Northeast the average score student in grades one through twelve scores 8 points less on a nonverbal exam, 9 points less on a verbal exam, 8 points less on a reading exam and 10 points less on a math exam (Coleman, 1966, pp. 252, 258, 256).

Not only are such scores lower, but the gap seems to accelerate over a period of time. The urban Negro student tends to fall further behind his white counterpart as they complete successive grades in school. The average Negro core student in the Northeast is 5.2 grade levels behind his white suburban counterpart in math by the twelfth grade, 2.0 grade levels behind in reading, and 3.3 grade levels behind in verbal ability. Figures are similar in the Midwest and worse in the far West (Coleman, 1966, pp. 274, 275).

Table 6 (not printed in RECORD) was compiled by the Center for Urban Education from data gathered from an intensive analysis of over 200 studies on the subject of academic progress. It dramatically describes the progress for black and disadvantaged children following almost identical patterns, in contrast with normal progress. These children score slightly below their more advantaged counterparts when first tested in either grades one or two, and thereafter progress at steady rates which are lower than normal. The gap increases as the child proceeds through school until at the end of the ninth grade, he is generally two and a half years behind. Summarizing these conclusions in numerical terms, the figures on Table 7 represent the mean percent of normal expectation actually achieved at the appropriate grade level. For the disadvantaged group, the mean proportion drops from a high of 80.1 percent in the second grade to a low of 68.0 percent by the end of the eighth grade. For the black group, the mean starts at 94.7 percent and then remains in the area of the low 70's. These data might lead one to the spurious conclusion that minority and disadvantaged groups begin school with lower intelligence and/or academic capabilities and that their abilities diminish over time. In many cases, school programs manifest content which reinforces such a conclusion. What these data really point out is that the complex of disadvantages during pre-school years serve as obstacles to the student's early learning which his more advantaged counterpart does not face. For the Spanish-speaking student, these obstacles are compounded. Not only does he contend with the problems of poverty but he must also contend with a language barrier as well. As the student progresses through school, he continues to face those environmental obstacles (described in Chapter III). But now he meets an educational program which is worlds apart from that environment, generally indifferent to the growing toll which that environment exacts of him, and geared neither to capitalize on his strengths nor respond to his needs.

TABLE 7.—MEAN PROPORTION OF ACHIEVEMENT

Grade	Disadvantaged	Black
1		94.7
2	80.1	84.5
3	75.9	78.6
4	72.5	71.9
5	76.0	69.7
6	74.6	73.5
7	68.2	
8	68.0	71.8

Source: Fox, memorandum No. 1, the Center for Urban Education, pp. 21, 23.

TABLE 8.—STATUS IN RELATIONSHIP TO NORMS BY GRADE VARIABLE AND CITY 1967-69 READING AND ARITHMETIC[1]

Grade	Variable	Detroit, September 1969	Los Angeles January 1968	Los Angeles May 1968	Milwaukee, September, October 1967	Philadelphia, April, May 1968	St. Louis, April, May 1968	New York, April 1968
2	Reading		−.8	−.6		−.6		(2)
	Arithmetic concepts					−.4		
3	Reading		−.9	−.7		−.6		
	Arithmetic					−.5		
4	Reading	−.9			−.5	−1.1		(2)
	Arithmetic	−.6			−.3	−1.0		
5	Reading					−1.2		
	Arithmetic					−1.0		
6	Reading				−.6	−1.2		−.8
	Arithmetic				−.6	−1.1		
7	Reading					−1.5		−.4
	Arithmetic					−1.6		
8	Reading	−1.2			−.6	−1.4	−1.0	
	Arithmetic	−1.5			−.8	−1.7	−1.0	

[1] Where a vocabulary and reading comprehension score were both available, the reading comprehension score was used here. Similarly arithmetic concepts was used when it and arithmetic problem solving were both available.
[2] At norm.

Source: Fox memorandum No. 1 "The Center for Urban Education" p. 8.

Visits by staff of the Center for Urban Education to major cities revealed that in each city and in each grade for which data were available, there was city-wide retardation in achievement. Table 8 indicates the steadily worsening achievement levels of city students.

A telephone survey by OE staff to superintendents of several large cities and their suburbs indicated a reading level gap between city and suburban students of approximately two years at the sixth grade level. Results of this survey are partially indicated in Table 9.

We can only conclude from these data that the core city youngster has little basis on which to count on the education system with its present programs and levels of funding to provide him with the opportunity to achieve academically. The cycle of expectation of failure is a difficult one to break. As teachers expect low academic achievement from minority and disadvantaged students, they provide programs that are notably lacking in motivational techniques and substance that are the key elements in programs more often presented to the more advantaged students with high success expectations. As programs have been analyzed a progression of various concerns and debunking of various methods have been expressed, just as pointed out in this chapter's introduction, various people and institutions have been blamed. Teacher expectation is by no means the only problem. Over a period of time, the catalog of "what is wrong in urban education" has included earlier starting dates for children cultural enrichment, more urban and relevant materials, more minority group role models, ego—identification, individualism of instruction, parent involvement, the right to read, and so on. Yet, tragically coupled with all else that is wrong, teachers' expectations of failure, are, as anticipated, met by the students. And more dangerously, they begin to project the system's failures onto themselves and cease to hold their own capabilities in high regard. With little faith in their own abilities and in the system's ability to convey an opportunty for success, school becomes a meaningless use of their time. Possibilities of earning money, or simply doing nothing, become more attractive to them.

TABLE 9.—AVERAGE READING ACHIEVEMENT GRADE LEVELS OF STUDENTS IN THE 6th GRADE

	Reading achievement level	Difference
Detroit	5.1	
Grosse Point, Mich	8.0	2.9
Atlanta	4.3	
Fulton County, Ga	6.9	2.6
New York	5.0	
Scarsdale, N.Y	7.5	2.5
Cleveland, Ohio	5.4	
Shaker Heights, Ohio	7.8	2.4
Los Angeles	5.0	
Beverly Hill, Calif	7.0	2
Philadelphia	5.6	
Lower Marion, Pa	7.5	1.9
Newark, N.J	6.2	
Tenafly, N.J	7.3	1.1

Source: Data received over the phone by members of Urban Education Task Force from selected school districts using 1969 achievement data.

Drop-out rates.—Students whom the system has failed reject that system in disturbingly high numbers. Urban school systems fail to hold approximately one in four of their students through the full term of high school. The rate increases with the size of the city.

Both percentages and/or actual numbers of dropouts have been on the rise during the past decade. Table 10 indicates that during the period from 1960 through 1963, twelve major cities experienced an average student loss of approximately 30 percent, or 74,249 dropouts.

TABLE 10—LOSS IN NUMBER OF PUPILS, BY GRADES, FROM GRADE 10 THROUGH HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION (SEPTEMBER 1960 THROUGH JUNE 1963)

Cities	Loss in number of pupils by grades: Grade 10, 1960–61	Grade 11, 1961–62	Grade 12, 1962–63	Total loss, grades 10 to 12	Percent not graduating from reporting systems
New York, N.Y	8,843	15,281	5,125	29,249	37.05
Chicago, Ill	4,345	3,532	858	8,735	33.95
Los Angeles, Calif	3,275	3,423	704	7,402	22.83
Philadelphia, Pa	4,255	4,219	+54	8,402	46.60
Detroit, Mich	4,138	2,008	480	6,626	37.84
Baltimore, Md	1,494	1,248	733	3,475	34.98
Houston, Tex	1,337	855	+268	1,924	21.39
Cleveland, Ohio	1,349	789	24	2,162	31.37
Washington, D.C	779	679	4	1,462	29.61
St. Louis, Mo	945	108	67	1,120	24.70
Milwaukee, Wis	387	940	330	1,657	26.19
San Francisco, Calif	910	1,003	122	2,035	33.15

Source: "A study of the holding power rates of school systems in 128 large cities, population over 90,000, based on the graduating classes of 1960–63, inclusive," by Daniel Schrieber project; School Dropouts National Education Association, 1201 16th St. NW., Washington, D.C. App. A, table A, p. 56.

Warnings of the educational system's limited holding power went unheeded during the early years of this decade. As the years passed, the dropout rate became larger. For example, in 1963, Los Angeles had a total dropout figure of 7,402; but in 1967 that figure had risen to 12,086. The percentage of 22.83 percent in 1963 had risen to 27.00 percent in 1967. In 1968 the dropout percentage was the same as in 1967 but the number of dropouts had risen to 12,137. Within one year from 1963 to 1964 the Milwaukee dropout rate increased from the tabulated 26.19 to 27.6 percent.[27]

In 1965, former President Johnson told Congress: "In our fifteen largest cities, 60 percent of the tenth grade students from poverty neighborhoods "drop out before finishing high school" (*State of the Union Message,* 1965). Since roughly 10 percent never get to the tenth grade, the proportion is even larger. In 1967 approximately 65 percent of all black and Puerto Rican New York City students left school before graduation (*Carnegie Quarterly,* Fall 1968, p. 1)

Among Mexican Americans, the problem during the earlier years is even more acute. According to the Texas Education Agency, as many as 60 percent of the approximately 100,000 non-English speaking first graders entering the system each year will have dropped out of school permanently before elementary school graduation (Stemmler, 1966, p. 43).

The educational system's ability to hold students showed a continued slackening grip by 1968. Daniel Schreiber, in June of that year, published an article in *American Education* in which he indicated that the year 1967 had witnessed a total of 734,000 dropouts, 580,000 of whom were white with the remaining 154,000 nonwhite (Schreiber, 6/1968, p. 6). The rate of drop-out among minority students compared to that of white students is startling. Negro students in the metropolitan North and West are more than three times as likely as whites to drop out of school by ages 16 and 17 (*One year Later* 1969, p. 29). An average of 48 perrcent of the non-white population over 25 lacks a high school diploma as opposed to 27.5 percent of whites (*Digest of Educational Statistics*). A higher percentage of the black population, as compared to the white, may be dropping out of school but the figures clearly indicate that there is much dissatisfaction with the existing school system on the part of both white and nonwhite American youth.

Work-study programs, street academies, storefront schools, public and private manpower training programs, Upward Bound, and the Job Corps are all involved in working with dropouts and potential dropouts. These programs are promising evidence of the effort to salvage the wastage of our youth. But, as the above figures show, these efforts are far from accomplishing the salvage job on the scale that is needed.

Growth of hostility toward the system.—That the student is perceiving the education system with increasing hostility is being demonstrated all too painfully. The drop-out, who, as we saw in ever increasing numbers in the preceding section, does not merely release his hostility in the act of breaking his

Footnotes at end of article.

association with the educational system. The National Commission on Civil Disorders showed a significant and prophetic relationship between education and rioting. In its survey of riot cities, it became evident that the typical riot participant was a high school dropout. Conversely, "the counter-rioters were clearly the best educated. . . . Apparently high levels of education and income not only prevented rioting but are more likely to lead active, responsible opposition to rioting . . ." (Kerner, et al., 1968, p. 132).

"Drop-out-ism" and rioting are two of many expressions of today's students' hostility toward society in general and toward the education system in particular. Violence directed at the school and its symbols is being exhibited at a cost that far exceeds the monetary damage. And violence may be viewed in varying degrees of intensity which grow from vandalism against property to assault and even murder of individuals associated with the system. Students who begin their overt resentment of the system through vandalism against school property may be telling us that the system will not listen to them when they speak softly and peacefully. As Bruno Bettleheim has pointed out:

"Violence is, of course, a short cut toward gaining an objective. . . . Whether or not it will be used or avoided depends entirely on what alternative solutions are known to a person facing a problem." (Bettleheim, 1966, p. 72).

Perhaps the most serious aspect of vandalism is the set of messages it conveys—that many students look upon the school as alien territory, hostile to their ambitions and hopes—that the education which the system is attempting to provide lacks meaningfulness, and that they feel no pride in the edifices in which they spend most of their days.

The usual reaction of the school system and of the general public to acts of vandalism has been one of anger, not only because of the damage caused and the hostilities expressed, but because of the seeming senselessness of the acts. However, studies of youth violence have indicated—without absolving the perpetrators of responsibility for their acts—that vandalism is not as pointless or aimless as it appears.

John M. Martin of Fordham University has said that every incident of vandalism is "both meaningful to the participants and understandable in terms of the situation in which it occurs" (New York Times, July 14, 1969, p. 37). Stanley Cohen of the University of Durham, England, confirms Martin's earlier findings.

"The usual terms used to describe various forms of vandalism obscure and discredit what may be the real explanations: if a boy breaks into his school and smashes up the classrooms because he has a grievance against the teachers, it is no help to call his behavior 'wanton' and 'pointless.' . . . Most research into school vandalism indicates, in fact, that there *is* something wrong with the school that is damaged. *The highest rates of school vandalism tend to occur in schools with obsolete facilities and equipment, low staff morale and high dissatisfaction and boredom among the pupils.*" (Cohen, November 11, 1968, pp. 497–500.)

The lesson of these studies is that though the public and the system may be justifiably angry at the destructiveness and maliciousness of acts of vandalism, they "hide their heads in the sand" if they dismiss the acts as being senseless, pointless, or aimless. Cohen's research reveals that the schools are seen as deficient, frustrating, hopeless places by the vandals.

Systems generally are failing to heed this message. By so doing, they face two inevitable effects: (1) rising financial losses; and (2) increased frustration levels among students which lead to more serious forms of violence. These effects are discussed below.

(1) The financial burden the system must bear through vandalism is overwhelming. It is estimated that the public school systems in the Nation's 193 largest urban areas have suffered at least $70 million from school vandalism each year since 1960, and costs have increased at a faster rate as the frequency of vandalic acts has multiplied.

In the 1967–68 school year, New York City public schools recorded $2,716,757 in damages. Costs in Chicago in 1968 reached $992,542, not including $800,000 for broken glass replacement. In the same year, the costs of school vandalism per pupil reached a high of $6.84 per pupil in Tampa, and a mean for the Nation's twelve largest school systems exceeded $1.50 per pupil. Table 11, on the following three pages conveys a devastating message.

(2) The systems' response to the message left by the vandals only serves to cause further frustration among students, which is expressed by more serious forms of violence. School administrators express their growing alarm at the rising tide of damage to school property by installing expensive electronic detection devices, changing building design, employing armed guards accompanied by dogs, training themselves in police methods, and even by flying helicopters at low altitudes with powerful searchlights each night—in short doing those things which will further reduce pupil, parent and teacher morale, and further destroy any feelings of mutual respect and openness so essential to good learning.

Following simple vandalism directed at school property, there develops a frightening shift toward assault on people who are seen as extensions of the system.

Acts of vandalism are a reflection of student and community attitude towards the schools of the major cities in the Nation. Data that more reliably permit us to view student attitude towards the schools and their teaching personnel are the figures related to cases of violence committed by students upon school personnel. In Philadelphia, for example, there was a 500 percent increase in the number of reported assaults on or threats to school personnel in the period 1962–63 to 1967–68.

TABLE 11.—VANDALISM BY TYPE, NUMBER AND COST FOR SELECTED GREAT CITIES, 1966–67

City school system	Types of offenses: Total Number	Total Cost	Windows Number	Windows Cost	Larceny Number	Larceny Cost	Arson Number	Arson Cost	Miscellaneous vandalism Number	Miscellaneous vandalism Cost	Cost per number of offense
New York City	207,775	$1,952,795	205,218	$1,026,900	2,358	$787,301	199	$139,404	(1)	(1)	$9.39
Los Angeles	3,515	555,491	2,000	19,793	274	373,270	41	116,147	1,200	$46,281	158.03
Detroit	2,123	515,319	666	249,296	1,434	183,000	23	83,023	(1)	(1)	242.73
Cincinnati	7,195	444,500	4,535	123,125	824	106,096	130	115,316	1,706	104,963	62.47
Baltimore	67,176	267,458	66,632	191,345	477	47,897	19	19,863	48	8,353	3.98
Newark	29,384	251,459	28,690	69,926	489	29,368	40	125,894	165	26,171	8.55
Washington, D.C	36,748	251,123	36,525	180,202	223	70,921	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	6.83
Philadelphia	110,125	250,000	109,500	250,000	369	(1)	80	(1)	176	(1)	2.27
Cincinnati	9,639	226,757	9,307	72,408	166	9,123	(1)	(1)	166	145,226	26.25
Milwaukee	2,056	215,063	1,531	98,738	244	69,253	28	6,676	253	40,396	104.85
Boston	1,135	213,700	840	128,000	153	58,600	38	18,800	104	8,300	188.28
Kansas City, Mo	11,075	114,672	10,860	74,866	71	31,151	(1)	(1)	144	8,655	10.35
Memphis	9,563	101,897	9,220	64,497	(1)	21,500	(1)	(1)	343	15,900	10.65
Minneapolis	389	67,220	300	76,200	42	720	3	7,200	44	3,100	224.22
St. Paul	4,366	73,675	4,154	43,248	166	23,945	6	100	40	1,382	16.87
Pittsburgh	7,544	72,398	7,125	47,780	126	6,154	(1)	(1)	293	18,464	9.60
Tampa	6,575	62,297	5,955	17,793	425	40,483	(1)	(1)	195	9,021	10.23
Tulsa	1,768	65,000	1,560	23,400	208	41,600	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	36.76
Wichita	2,059	55,430	(1)	41,492	(1)	10,770	(1)	(1)	(1)	3,168	27.92
Oakland	1,112	54,344	465	9,292	165	11,160	135	26,973	347	6,919	48.87
Syracuse	3,500	48,871	3,500	48,871	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	13.96
Dayton	265	45,461	195	34,101	65	7,360	5	4,000	(1)	(1)	171.55
Jefferson County	806	42,823	714	12,846	67	24,671	----	----	25	5,288	53.13
Corpus Christi	(1)	40,778	(1)	12,599	(1)	8,924	(1)	11,887	(1)	7,368	(1)
Portland	2,285	40,764	1,000	18,662	290	14,296	37	486	958	7,320	17.83
Richmond	154	40,414	(1)	27,188	76	2,843	1	8,875	77	1,508	262.43
San Antonio	(1)	40,000	(1)	26,000	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	14,000	(1)
New Orleans	2,837	36,986	2,272	12,000	235	24,886	3	100	327	(1)	13.03
Louisville	333	33,254	333	26,560	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	6,694	99.86
Denver	9,182	29,189	8,964	18,371	218	10,818	NR	(1)	(1)	(1)	3.17
Norfolk	1,592	25,490	1,365	8,191	155	10,500	----	----	72	6,799	16.01
Birmingham	92	20,944	(1)	(1)	91	15,994	1	5,000	(1)	(1)	228.19
El Paso	181	14,304	79	(1)	63	7,242	2	994	37	6,064	79.02
Beaumont	515	5,500	400	2,000	80	300	----	----	35	3,200	10.68
St. Louis	1,108	(1)	1,108	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Indianapolis	1,100	(1)	1,100	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Not reported.

Source: Vandalism Study of Selected Great Cities for 1966–67, prepared by Baltimore City Public Schools, Division of Research and Development, Bureau of Records and Statistics, June 1968.

Table 12 includes only reported incidents. The number of actual incidents is probably higher than reported. Other cities have reported similar incidents which are related to student-teacher interaction rather than to black-white tensions, inflamed by activist movements. The assaults upon teachers has sharply risen within the last two years. In Chicago, for instance, the assaults upon teachers during the first six months of the September 1968 term were up to 30 percent over the same period in 1967. The plight of East St. Louis where three out of four of the city's 900 teachers are carrying guns is indeed a frightening one.

The move from attacks on school property to attacks on school personnel was slow in coming. This is partially because in the beginning there was no support in the home for an attack upon the school system in any overt manner. In part the slowness was due to the student realizing that he was attacking an authority figure who represented his parent. In the beginning, the child sees the teacher as the agent of the parent, a parent surrogate. Psychologically, to attack such a figure was to attack not just authority but one's parent.

TABLE 12.—ASSAULTS ON OR THREATS TO SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN THE PHILADELPHIA SCHOOL SYSTEM

	Number reported		
	Total	Assaults	Threats
School year:			
1967 to 1968	121	107	14
1966 to 1967	107	104	3
1965 to 1966	109	92	17
1964 to 1965	68	47	21
1963 to 1964	62	48	14
1962 to 1963	20	16	14

Source: The School District of Philadelphia, Office of Research, analysis of incidents reported by the Philadelphia senior high schools, 1962–3 through October 1968, p. 3.

However, the attack did in fact come against the school's personnel. The system was perceived as the child's enemy, especially the black child's. The black child had now reached the stage where he was attacking the values of his own previous generation, the values of his own parents as well as the white society surrounding him. The attack on the parent made it possible to attack physically the agent of the parent. The black youth began to attack the existing black leadership as being emasculated by white school systems and centuries of oppression. The youth-oriented and youth led SNCC attacked the established adult civil rights groups such as the NAACP and the Urban League. Others began attacking the term "Negro" as no longer appropriate, since it was given to blacks by the white man. Black youth looked upon their fathers as failures as guides in the struggle for emancipation (Feuer, 1969, pp. 394–396).

But more was happening to the youths of the cities. As indicated previously, there was also a growing frustration, hostility and restiveness on the part of adults due to increased awareness of the second class status of the black man. This sense of hostility towards the system was felt by the non-white child. His growing dissatisfaction with the educational system moved from dropping out of school and mischievous vandalism to destruction of the buildings, and finally to the attack upon the person, the ultimate confrontation with the system. In his own eyes he now could believe that his action would have the sanction of parental authority. Another factor that made this combination of tangible and psychological factors result in violent outburst at the educational system and those who run it was the system's inability to teach the non-white children whose numbers were constantly growing. Along with the growing number comes growing sense of power.

Although the civil rights movement has roots prior to 1964, it is in the mid 1960's that its major impetus is most noted. The public school student did not move into action as fast as the civil rights movement. His dissatisfaction with the educational system initially took the form already documented. It was not until the last two years that significant change occurred. Its delay was due to the fact that the child's mind is not a *tabula rása*. The non-white child was a product of the previous generation and had been socialized in the home and elementary school to perform and respond in adult-determined ways and to accept the ways of the school as correct. He had to overthrow these internalized values he held concerning the educational system. He had to modify, if not eliminate, certain beliefs that he would be allowed to achieve equally, according to his ability with his white peer. He had to convey these new realizations. Too, often he conveyed them violently. But he had a message.

If vandalism was a matter of a few isolated incidents, the message could be set down as the voice of a few disgruntled misfits. But it is occurring on a massive scale everywhere in the Nation and in the large urban school systems in particular. The message is inescapable—it is a large vote of no confidence in the schools by a growing number of pupils.

The System's Problems as Perceived By Its Faculty

On Wednesday, September 3, 1969, *The Education Daily* (Vol. 2, No. 165) reported that about 75,000 teachers in at least 13 states were involved in disputes with their school systems. Cited specifically were:

Los Angeles, where 30,000 teachers are demanding a 14 percent increase in starting pay, and where 1,000 teaching slots are unfilled as the season starts.

New York, where 70 locals were without contract including 10,000 teachers in districts where the situation was critical.

Michigan, where 170 local education associations with 31,000 teachers were not under contract.

Tennessee, Indiana, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah, and *Wisconsin,* where teacher strikes were in effect.

The problems which the system faces in the area of personnel are discussed in detail earlier in the chapter. What we wish to note here are the teachers' ever increasing grievances with the system. And while the teachers are an integral part of the system, their strikes which are occurring with increasing frequency hold a message for the system as much as that expressed by the students and while many of the strikes involve financial grievances, there is an implicit plea on the part of teachers for society's respect and valuation of their role. Underpaid and afforded little status in hierarchy of professions, many teachers feel that students will hardly respect them if their place in the larger society is rewarded no more significantly than the sanitation workers.

Perhaps certain teachers deserve no higher reward, but it is significant in recent literature to note the increasing number of volumes in which teachers are highly critical of those of their profession who are indifferent to or failing at their jobs and are just as critical of the system which shields such failures. A whole new genre has crept into the educational literature—the expression of the "angry young teachers" who view other teachers and the system as the failures in the educative process. A few such noteworthy examples would include:

Death at an Early Age: The Destruction of the Heart and Minds of Negro Children in the Boston Public Schools, by Jonathan Kozol, 1967.

36 Children, by Herbert Kohl, 1967.

The Way It Spozed To Be, by James Herndon, 1968.

How Children Fail, by John Holt, 1964.

Our Children Are Dying, by Nat Hentoff, 1966.

Education for Alienation, by Nathaniel Hickerson, 1966.

Village School Downtown: Politics and Education, A Boston Report, by Peter Schrag, 1967.

This brief catalog is only set out as examples of a few voices out of many that are beginning to be heard. Related to such voices is one recent film entitled "High School" produced by Frederick Wiseman which revealed the shortcomings and shortsightedness of one urban system in regarding its own schools. The system gave Wiseman free access to what it judged to be one of its most highly rated schools. The messages of the lack of communication between administration, teacher and student; the stifling of student individuality and the words of the students themselves, quickly ended the system's expectation of a film to justify its pride in that school. The film is not shown in that city.

The system is failing the needs of its good teachers and its good teachers are realizing with increasing frustration that even they, while a part of their system, are failing the needs of the students.

The System's Problems as Perceived by the Community

Neither the white nor the minority communities have expressed indications that they are satisfied with the schools as they now are serving their children. Both have expressed the deep conviction that the schools must belong to their particular communities—although the forms of expressing the conviction may markedly vary.

In the suburbs, as well as in the cities, majorities of white populations have expressed their alienation from the schools at the polls in many recent votes on bond issues and tax support. Chapter II discussed this lack of confidence in detail.

Minority populations with more cause to judge the schools as failures, have less financial "clout" over the schools, and thus have had generally less decision-making powers over them. It has been this exclusion from the decision-making of the system that has led to the recent upsurge of feeling in the inner-city community that the community has the right to control the schools. The failure of the system to meet impoverished children's needs, in particular, has led such communities to believe that they could certainly do no worse a job educating their children than the present system is doing. Moreover, they believe they could probably do a better job—because of their more direct and personal comprehension of the needs and problems of their children.

The highly vocal demands for decentralization and community control on the part of minority communities, particularly the black communities, have been, in many cases, coupled with the move toward racial and cultural separatism. What is happening in the black communities' attitudes toward education is being paralleled in their militant attitudes expressed in local and national politics. Generally stated, the attitude is: if the white establishment fails to provide equal opportunity, the blacks will do it themselves—by themselves—for themselves.

The movement in most large cities toward alternative forms of education is clearly indicative of further community dissatisfaction. Such alternatives range from large subsystem projects, such as Ocean Hill-Brownsville (New York) to smaller community-operated schools—like Adams-Morgan in Washington, D.C., and intermittent demands for a voucher system.

The ineffective use of Federal funds in the schools has become a major community con-

cern. In States, such as Mississippi, which represent an extreme, protests have been declared by black communities as to the misdirection of funds under Title I, ESEA which are supposed to aid the disadvantaged student. What is happening in Mississippi is by no means an isolated event. Urban communities in states across the Nation have become increasingly aware of the uneven distribution of funds which have favored suburban and rural areas. Moreover, these urban school systems have done comparatively little with those funds they have received to improve the educational level of the inner city student. It has now occurred to the groups representing target populations to begin claiming title to those new Federal funds as belonging to them—and their demands are becoming more vocal as well as more perceptive as to the intent of the funds.

It becomes increasingly apparent that the urban education system has raised the dissatisfaction level of the parents and urban communities of any racial or ethnic group—impoverished and affluent alike. The emerging interdependency thrust mentioned in Chapter I has yet to be fully articulated and demonstrated. However, some examples of it are to be found although not labeled as such. The Community Schools of Flint, Michigan, and the Anacostia Community School Project (D.C.) could probably be considered as manifesting this thrust. Certainly, successful Head Start and Follow Through projects manifest varying degrees of it as well. Programs and projects genuinely reflecting this thrust are promising signs in urban education systems.

Summary of Chapter

The Task Force members agree that the education system is generally failing to provide the inner-city economically and educationally disadvantaged student an educational experience which will afford him an equal opportunity to enter the occupational and cultural mainstream. Although the members vary in their judgment as to the extent of the system's responsibility for its failure, all agreed that major changes were needed with significant increases in funding levels to effect such changes. The minority report expressed the view that only with very significantly increased Federal funds would the school systems ever be able to provide the educational programs needed. The point was stressed that there has never been enough money for education and that this approach ought to be tried.

This chapter continued to examine the overwhelming obstacles faced by the system, in addition to those of finance (Chapter II) and environment of the student (Chapter III). Such obstacles relate to the extensive migration of poor uneducated members of racial and ethnic minority groups into the inner city where they have settled in isolated pockets.

Not only are educational programs and staff attitudes which were successful with previous urban populations ineffective with these groups, but facilities and personnel are inadequate to meet their needs and numbers. Unmet, these problems become increasingly complex and increasingly significant for their part in the system's failure to educate the student.

Beyond the system's problems in coping with the increased numbers, lack of facilities and lack of personnel, it has demonstrated a blindness in perception of the student of today's inner city. By and large, the system has expected that student to be a failure, and unaware of its failure, has succeeded in creating the student in its own image. The teachers of the urban system are generally less educated, less able, and less experienced than those of the suburbs. They are too often of different backgrounds from their students. They gain little status for teaching the disadvantaged. For these reasons, and others, urban teachers are generally unsuccessful in relating to and perceiving their students.

In turn, the students, certain teachers, and the community develop their own perception of the system. They have perceived the system as not meeting their needs.

The students have reason for such a perception. They are not being given the opportunity to achieve academically. The inner city students of a racial minority score lower than their more affluent white counterparts on achievement tests when they enter the system and tend to fall further behind as they complete successive grades in school. The system has not met their needs nor recognized their strengths and aspirations. The students have recently begun to articulate the frustrations that underlie their perceptions. They have done so first by dropping out of school and then through acts of vandalism against school property followed by acts of violence against the personnel of the school. Significantly their violence has occurred more frequently in situations where something *is* wrong with the school, such as its facilities or its personnel. The system has all too often not heeded the messages conveyed by these students and has generally responded with repressive measures that only tend to increase student hostility.

A growing number of teachers are coming into conflict with the system. Strikes, disagreements, unsigned contracts, etc., are becoming commonplace headlines. And teachers are courageously speaking out against ineffective fellow teachers and repressive, unimaginative systems in a new brand of angry literature.

Communities both black and white have expressed their judgment of the system's responsibility for its own failure through defeat of local bond issues, demands for decentralized, community controlled schools, and alternative systems. Their judgment has probably lent in some cases at least tacit approval to their children's dropping out or expressing disapproval in less peaceful ways. The communities have grown increasingly aware of the presence and purpose of Federal funds in local systems and have expressed their dissatisfaction with the system's relatively ineffectual use of such funds.

There are, throughout the urban education system, indications of change which offer real promise for the future—and some example of these have been cited. However, the decade of the 1970's must bring with it, a rapid acceleration and expansion of changes in urban education systems if we are to have schools which will effectively educate all of our impoverished urban children and youth. No urban education system has succeeded in achieving this goal in the 1960's. It must be accomplished in the 1970's.

Chapter V

The Impoverished Urban Student

In the three preceding chapters, we have presented evidence to show the three major aspects of the massive urban education problem: the financial crisis, the urban environment, and the education system itself. In this chapter, we focus on the student—not in terms of listing his so-called deficiencies," (e.g., low verbal skills, "wrong" language—speaking Spanish instead of English) but, instead, concentrating on what he has to offer the school which provides the basis for planning the educational program.

What we are arguing for—indeed, pleading for—in this chapter is the discarding of the practice of comparing this student with his suburban counterpart. In effect, we are trying to dispel—and discredit—the mediating stereotype mentioned in Chapter I which has largely resulted in viewing the impoverished urban student as deficient in all the really important behaviors associated with academic success. We say "trying" because the new voluminous literature on the disadvantaged student abounds with accounts of his deficiencies. The accounts of the strengths and assets of this student are comparatively sparse, and usually appear in the form of anecdotal reports. Occasionally, they are manifested through a process of analogical reasoning, e.g., if he is smart enough to plan ways for systematically disrupting instruction in the classroom from the teacher's point of view, then he must be smart enough to deal with cause and effect relationships in printed material.

Often his particular forms of manifesting the behaviors which underlie academic success are misinterpreted because their significance for school learning is not recognized, are overlooked because too much else is happening at the same time in the classroom, or are disregarded because he has already been judged as incapable of or indifferent to the school's program. Whatever the reason(s) involved, his manifestations of the critical behaviors very often do not surface on the typical standardized achievement tests, intelligence tests, or on teacher ratings of "desired" classroom behaviors.

The previous—and current—pattern has been to make careful frequency counts of the instances of such behaviors as acts of vandalism, low reading achievement scores, number of days absent, and the like. But how many times have we taken the same care to count the instances of such behaviors as protecting a younger brother or sister from harm; facing down his own fatigue, hunger, or emotions to struggle through a dull reading lesson; refusing a heroin pop at a party; deciding to go to school on a day when all his friends are cutting out; or teaching himself or a younger child a sport? Such displays of personal courage, resiliency and stamina, problem-solving, concern for others, and choices among options occur every day in and out of school—as everyone who has ever worked or lived in the inner city well knows. However, it proved to be a fruitless effort to find the evidences of these latter kinds of behaviors arrayed in general statistical summaries in the "disadvantage" literature—the mediating stereotype was everywhere. Therefore, the evidence concerning these behaviors in this chapter is of necessity a combination of direct experience, anecdotal report, and analogical reasoning.

The impoverished urban student has an excellent capacity for problem-solving. Daily, he contends with problems of the value systems of at least two worlds: the home or neighborhood and the school. Daily, he must thread his way through the set of values which the school espouses and the set which he lives with and has learned from his family and neighborhood. He must develop and carry out strategies which permit him to survive in both worlds without being overwhelmed by the conflict diverse value systems can produce. The extent to which he survives as a whole human being with a strong and stable self-concept and a sense of worth will be dependent on the quality and reality orientation of the strategies he employs.

An example of this conflict of values between neighborhood and school is afforded by fighting. In the impoverished inner city, prowess in fighting is usually an important aspect of the masculine self-concept and is often an important attribute for maintaining the leadership of a gang or group. The following quotation from *Manchild in the Promised Land* exemplifies this value.

"As I saw it in my childhood, most of the cats I swung around with were more afraid of not fighting than they were of fighting. This was how it was supposed to be, because this was what we had come up under. The adults in the neighborhood practiced this. They lived by the concept that a man was supposed to fight. When two little boys got into a fight in the neighborhood, the men around would enhance them and egg them

on. They'd never think about stopping the fight." (Brown, 1965, p. 263).

In the school, however, fighting—efficient or otherwise—is not admired, is not condoned, and is often viewed as the sign of a trouble-maker or potential delinquent. The old bromide, "When in Rome, do as the Romans do," does not really apply here. He has *not* left his hometown far behind, it's right there in the classroom in the form of the kids on the block and the values he brings with him through the school door. No matter which way he moves with regard to fighting, he is in line for some form of reprisal. If he goes along with the school, he may catch it when he leaves the school premises and endanger his standing in the neighborhood—not to mention the blow to his own self-esteem. If he opposes the school position, he will most assuredly buy trouble. He can opt for either one of these "extremes." Or, he can work out a compromise somewhere in the middle. Talking it over with a teacher—or a guidance counselor—is a highly unlikely solution. Talking it over at home is also unlikely—there are usually too many other children, too many other problems to be dealt with, and the adults may not really have a clear sense of the best choice to make either. An illustration of this last point is below noted.

"They were trying to guide us and make us do right and be good, and they didn't even know what being good was. When I was a little boy, Mama and Dad would beat me and tell, "You better be good," but I didn't know what being good was. To me, it meant that they just wanted me to sit down and fold my hands, or something crazy like that. Stay in front of the house, don't go any place, don't get into trouble. I didn't know what it meant and I don't think they knew what it meant, because they couldn't ever tell me what they really wanted. The way I saw it everything I was doing was good." (Brown, 1965, p. 289).

By and large, the inner city youngster must work out his own compromises and test them against the daily realities of his environment—all of which constitutes a very sophisticated form of problem solving anchored sharply to the real world. And what is remarkable is that he usually emerges from this process as a self-reliant human being. There is no task which the school can give him which requires such a high degree of problem solving. And yet the staff of a school will rarely register the conflict which this student experiences and resolves—let alone, capitalize upon his very real capability here.

Implied in the kind of problem-solving we have just described for the inner-city student are very considerable manifestations of intelligence, information, and persistence. A further example of such reality-oriented problem-solving is the case of the gang leader. Here, is the bright individual who, in the course of evolving and working out his strategies for survival in his world, has relegated the offerings of the school to the background. The compromises and strategies which he evolved in his childhood to survive in school and in the neighborood have been replaced by decisions and strategies which now afford more tangible and immediate graifications and recognition than anything else *either the neighborhood or the school could offer*. While his initial take-over of his group may have been partially accounted for by his skill with a switchblade or his fists, it is more likely that he succeeded largely through both his ideas and administrative or leadership ability. That is, he manifests the capacity to plan and implement a successful operation to provide needed gratification and recognition to the members, and to create an authority structure in which his role and the members' roles are clearly defined.

Accorded the leadership of the group, he must also be prepared to deal with challengers. Thus he must be a particularly good judge of character as well as a shrewd judge of how best to utilize the talents of his followers. As such, he is manifesting a set of capabilities that somehow the school was never able to capitalize upon in its programs. The options which the school potentially offered were discarded in favor of another option. And with his choice, society-at-large has lost a potential leader on a larger stage than the one he has chosen to be on. It is interesting to note that among those recruited for Upward Bound, the gang leader was sought after—clear testimony to his intelligence and his resourcefulness, and initiative as a leader.

An additional example of the problem-solving of the impoverished urban student is afforded by how he is dealing with the gap between his aspirations and the realities of his daily life Research related to the aspirations of blacks indicates a shift occurring between the 1950's to the present. In both the fifties and the early sixties, the research generally indicates that blacks had higher aspirations than whites (Boyd, 1959; Rosen, 1959; Reiss and Rhodes, 1959; Sprey, 1962). Such aspirations are clearly contradictory to the reality surrounding him. Whatever the conscious reasons the child or youth may have given for having such aspirations or thinking he could achieve them, the basic reason has to be fantasying in support of some ego need, and is a form of withdrawal from reality. Although such fantasies and the resulting withdrawal would produce a temporary respite from his environment, this pattern of problem-solving goes ultimately nowhere unless the fantasies are preliminary to subsequent action. Nevertheless, the pattern shows imagination and intelligence; it also shows a mechanism—albeit fragile—of protecting one's self-esteem.

In the later sixties, however, the research suggests a lessening of the gap between reality and aspiration. It is likely that with the concepts of black identity and "soul," the urban teenager now has a firmer basis on which his self-concept and aspiration can develop. He no longer needs to emulate the whites (Caro and Philbold, 1965; Antonovsky, 1967). The following statements by James Farmer in *Urban Schooling* are indicative of this change.

"When I was a lad of about ten in Austin, Texas, my pal and I would go downtown every Saturday afternoon to watch the Tarzan picture at the movie theater. It was a half-hour serial. The missionary was put in the pot; soon his tongue was hanging out and the sweat was dripping down his forehead as the heat built up underneath the pot. We all waited, chewing our popcorn in anticipation of Tarzan's arrival. But Tarzan was slow in coming, and the Africans danced faster and faster around the pot. Now and then a close-up of the face of one of the Africans flashed onto the screen; and I would elbow my friend and say, 'Erving, that's you.' Erving's response would be predictable. He would say, 'Naw, man, that ain't me. I didn't come from no Africa.' Erving represented the Negro people in his self-rejection and self-repudiation. A people was rejecting itself—denying it had roots. It was as if all the Negroes in the United States had suddenly sprung alive, full-grown, from the loins of the Deep South. It was as if the Negroes were without a heritage.

* * * * *

"But the Negro's concept of himself has been changing in these past ten years—and rapidly. A contributing factor, as I have said, has been the new image of Africa. As new nations emerge, the black man of this country saw proud black people from Africa representing their nations, arguing on the floor of the United Nations, appearing on radio and television, and speaking eloquently in English or in French. And the black man of this country witnessed the rise of these nations and asked himself, "Now, is that the boiling pot or is that the real Africa?" As the new image assumed greater proportions and dimensions, it started to eclipse the old image. The American Negro began to say, "That's Africa! That's me! That man is my brother. If he can do it, so can I!"

* * * * *

"Another long step in the development of a new self-image is being taken by the Negro living in America today. He is beginning to speak of himself as a black man and of his people as black people. Twenty years ago, if you walked through Harlem or Watts or Detroit and called a man a black man, he would have wanted to hit you" (Rudman & Featherstone, 1968, pp. 141–142).

As he becomes more secure in and of himself and watches his parents and other adults of the community challenge the lack of opportunity provided by and the discrimination of authorities in the community (e.g., real estate commission, mayor's office, school board), he—like the adults—begins to realize that such authorities are not out of reach. He is mounting protests with other students—and he is beginning to be recognized. His problem-solving strategies here with regard to the school often reflect violence, but they are certainly more reality-oriented than the fantasying and withdrawal which he previously engaged in. That he will continue to use such strategies until there is a reality-oriented payoff in line with his aspirations is indicated by the following statement.

"The victories that have been won have brought about changes in the life condition of the Negro middle class, but the poorer classes in the Negro Community have not yet been helped. The conditions of their existence remain the same. The black child in Watts and in Harlem still senses that in the nation's eyes he is nothing—a nobody—and that he is shut out." (Rudman & Featherstone, 1968, p. 143).

The impoverished urban student does have an excellent communication capability for the neighborhood world in which he lives. He is insightful, sensitive, and perceptive—and he knows that other worlds exist outside the one he lives in. But the schools rarely tap this source.

In his pamphlet, "Teaching the Unteachable," Kohl wrote:

"Children will not write if they are afraid to talk. Initially, they suspect teachers and are reluctant to be honest with them. They have had too many school experiences where the loyalty of the staff and the institutional obligations of teachers have taken precedence over honesty. They have seen too much effort to maintain face, and too little respect for justifiable defiance in their school lives. I think children believe that there is a conscious collusion between all of the adults in a school to maintain the impression that the authority is always right, and that life is always pleasant and orderly. Unfortunately, the collusion is unconscious or at least unspoken. This is dramatically true in slum schools where the pressures of teaching are increased by understaffing and a vague uneasiness about race which is always in the air."

* * * * *

"So we spoke. At first the children were suspicious and ashamed of what they'd written. But as I listened and allowed them to talk they became bolder and angrier, then finally quieter and relieved. I asked them to write down what they would do to change things, and they responded immediately."

* * * * *

"For several weeks after that the children wrote and wrote—what their homes were like, whom they liked, where they came from. I

discovered that everything I'd been told about the children's language was irrelevant. Yes, they were hip when they spoke, inarticulate and concrete. But their writing was something else, and they felt that no white man was judging their words, threatening their confidence and pride. They faced a blank page and wrote directly and honestly. Recently I have mentioned this to teachers who have accepted the current analyses of 'the language' of the 'disadvantaged.' They asked the obvious fact that 'disadvantaged' children will not speak in class because they cannot trust their audience." (Kohl, 1967, pp. 13, 16, 17).

As examples of this communication ability in verbal printed form consider the following writing which Kohl's students produced, ages 11 to 16.

"If I could change my block, I would stand on Madison Avenue and throw nothing but teargas in it. I would have all the people I like to get out of the block and then I would become very tall and have big hands and with my big hands I would take all of the narcotic people and pick them up with my hand and throw them in the nearest river and oceans. I would go to some of those old smart alic cops and throw them in the Oceans and Rivers too. I would let the people I like move into the projects so they could tell their friends that they live in a decent block. If I could do this you would never see 117 St. again." (pp. 16–17, Grace, age 11).

"Things

"Tears–
"what are they?
"who needs them?
"Emotions—
"I despise them!
"Happiness—
"I'll never have it!
"Why should I see it!
"These things—
"Please, I don't want any of them—so somebody take them away (I don't deserve them.)
"Help—please somebody! (but I suppose I don't deserve that either) (p. 30)."

"We can teach each other

"Inside I feel like I am a nice person; but I have to act like one too. I have to know what kind of person I am. Sometimes, I forget that other people have feelings. Teachers for example; sometimes I hurt them without knowing it. I can say or do something that is so hurtful that they can't say anything but 'Get up and get out.' They say this so they can go on and teach the rest of us a lesson. But teachers can hurt you too and they do it just to teach you a lesson.

"You are a child of learning in some ways, but in other ways children teach teachers. I don't know what a teacher is like or how she feels, just like a teachr doesn't really know what I'm like or how I feel. So I can teach her what and how I think and feel. Teachers have been children before, but they seem to forget what it's like because the time changes in the way that the weather changes. So they can't say, well it's like when I was a child.

"No it's not like that, because people are changing and our minds are changing too. So children teach teachers a new lesson, about children today." (Patricia Williams).

From such examples as the above—and many more could be cited, it is difficult to consider the impoverished urban student as deficient in verbal skills. What is also apparent from these examples is his responsiveness and creativity when he—like anyone else—is permitted to learn in a valid way for him. Further evidence of his communication capabilities and creativity is afforded by the outpouring of graphic art, music, poetry, and skill in the performing arts, which the impoverished students in Upward Bound produced when worked with in an effective program. What is equally apparent from the information cited in Chapters III and IV is that this student's communication capabilities, sensitivity, insight, and creativity are simply not being released and nurtured in the schools. And, again, society is losing a vast amount of talent.

The impoverished urban student is also noteworthy for his generosity, cooperation, and lack of hypocrisy. The realities of his neighborhood world require its residents to develop cooperative and generous patterns because survival is the first order of business. When the ever-present need to survive is coupled with the overcrowding, people really know basic and intimate facts about one another—thus, making pretense virtually impossible. Everybody knows who everybody else is—and what everybody else is doing. Hentoff (1966) comments on the generosity and cooperation in the following statement:

"That's one thing about ghetto communities. One way or another, people who have nowhere to go get taken care of. Last week a little girl in my class was looking out the window as the fire engines came screaming up. I rushed to see the fire, which was across the street. The girl said matter-of-factly, 'That's my house that's burning.' It was like she'd had so much happen to her that it was hard to get excited about just a fire. Anyway, by late afternoon, she, her three brothers, and her parents had places to stay." (Hentoff, 1966, p. 20).

In the schools, one sees evidence of the students cooperating and sharing with one another—behaviors which are often discouraged because everybody is to do *his own learning by himself*—an almost impossible demand for young children. For example, a young child who is having difficulty with identifying words in his (all-to-often inappropriate) reader will usually have immediate assistance from the others around him. In testing situations, the same behavior prevails. What we have here is a carry-over of the survival pattern of cooperation and sharing. Any anyone who has worked in the inner city is well aware of the sharing of an insufficient food supply with someone else when it is apparent that his situation is really critical.

The inner city student's candor and honesty are reflected in the examples of writing cited above. However, an additional example is cited which particularly exemplifies the starkness and awareness within his honesty and candor. In this case, the student is Juan Gonzales, age 17.

"Man, I hate where I live, the projects. I've been living in a project for the past few years and I can't stand it. First of all, no pets. I've been offered so many times dogs and cats and I can't have them because of the Housing. Then there's a watch out for the walls. Don't staple anything to the walls because then you have to pay for it. Don't hang a picture. There's a fine. And they come and they check to make sure.

"Don't make too much noise. The people upstairs and the people downstairs and the people on the side of you can hear every word and they've got to get some sleep. In the project grounds you can't play ball. In the project grounds you can't stay out late. About ten o'clock they tell you to go in or get out. Then . . . there's trouble because they don't want you to hang around in the lobby. . . .

"I guess in some ways the projects are better. Like when we used to live here before the projects, there was rats and holes and the building was falling apart. It was condemned so many times, and so many times the landlords fought and won. The building wasn't torn down until finally it was the last building standing. And you know what that is, the last building. . . . There's no place for those rates to go, or those bugs, or no place for the bums to sleep at night except in one building still standing. It was terrible. The junkies and the drunks would all sleep in the halls at night and my mother was real scared. That was the same time she was out of work and it didn't look to us like anything was ever going to get better." (Mayerson, 1965, pp. 39–40).

In this chapter, we have only briefly described and illustrated some of the capabilities and characteristics which the impoverished urban student reveals when he is looked at as *he* is—and not through a mediating stereotype which compares him unfavorably with his suburban counterpart of the same age. He has many more capabilities and strength than we have cited here, but these descriptions hopefully serve to illustrate how badly major changes in urban education systems are needed for this student. His strengths have only rarely been capitalized upon by the schools. When they have been, it has been by sensitive—and realistic—teachers and administrators using programs which are valid for this student—and thus for society as well.

What is most remarkable about this student is that when the program and the people implementing it are appropriate, he learns at a rapid rate—and he does so in spite of malnourishment, economic insecurity, emotional-social problems, and all the other elements which are interacting on and within him. That he can learn at such a rate is evidence not only of his courage, tenacity, and learning potential but of the high value he places in trying to receive an education as well.

PART II—THE FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

Overview

In Part Two, the Federal Responsibility, we continue with two additional aspects of the urban education situation from the standpoint of the Federal government. The two chapters included in this Part are specifically concerned with: (1) the problems in evaluating the impact of new Federal programs for impoverished populations; and (2) the Federal role as it relates to urban education in terms of its limits and obligations.

In this section, there are two points to bear in mind. One is that the Federal government is beginning to shift its focus from comparatively specific efforts in education to broad social action thrusts which encompass more than education per se. For example, the Economic Opportunity Act (1964) and the Elementaary and Secondary Education Act (1965) reach far beyond such legislation as that of the National Defense Education Act (1957). Problems in evaluating such programs have arisen as a result of their new thrusts. Of greatest importance are those of a conceptual and political nature rather than of a methodological one.

The other point is that the Federal role is not easily defined with regard to these broad educational programs. It is in the process of emerging and its development must take place in the midst of constitutional precedents and political realities.

With the problems in the areas of evaluation and the Federal role, we have attempted to analyze briefly their major dimensions as the groundwork for the recommendations in both areas which are made in Part Three.

Chapter VI.—Problems in evaluating the impact of current Federal programs for impoverished populations

An assessment of recent Federal efforts to upgrade education for impoverished populations calls for a look at the process whereby such efforts are evaluated. Although program evaluation is no novelty in education, the objects of this art have changed a great deal in recent years. The recent Federal thrust against poverty and discrimination has introduced a new phenomenon for evaluation; the impact of large-scale programs of social action in education. In addition to generating much activity in city schools, they have produced considerable confusion whenever efforts have been made to find out

whether they were "working." The sources of the confusion are fairly complex. Prior to 1964, the objects of evaluation in education consisted almost exclusively of small programs concerned with such matters as curriculum development or teacher training. They generally occurred in a single school or school district, and typically involved modest budgets and small research staffs. The research literature which grew up around these efforts naturally focused on familiar problems of design, instrumentation, and validity.

The Change in Federal Focus

This small-scale effort began to change, however, when the Federal government established national educational improvement programs in the mid-1960's. These programs—including Project Headstart, Title I of the 1965 ESEA, and Project Follow-Through—are programs of social action; unlike earlier efforts they are not focused narrowly on such things as teachers' in-service training or the content of a science curriculum, but broadly on such things as "improving education for the disadvantaged." Also, the Federal programs are neither aimed at a school or a school district, but at millions of children, in thousands of schools, in hundreds of school jurisdictions, in scores of states. Further, they are not conceived and executed by a teacher, a principal, a superintendent, or for that matter, a researcher. The new programs were conceived by the Congress, and are administered by bureaucracies, which are at great remove from the schools and school districts which actually execute them.

Simply to recite these differences is to suggest major new problems in program evaluation in education. These have been compounded by efforts to apply the inherited stock-in-trade of evaluation techniques to the new phenomena. The collision of new programs and old intellectual technologies is at the root of recent controversies over the programs' efficacy.

There is a persistent tendency in evaluation research to resolve all problems into methodological issues, but we do not regard the present difficulties in evaluating social action programs as really methodological. Most issues of this sort center around making satisfactory comparisons between "treated" subjects and some other criterion presumed to measure an otherwise comparable condition of non-treatment. These issues are formally the same regardless of the size, age, aim, or outcome of the program in question, and they have been extensively explored in the evaluation literature. Although these problems are serious, *the main difficulties in evaluating social action programs are political and conceptual.* The conceptual barriers arise from misunderstanding the nature of the programs; the political problems are little different from those which impede the effective development of social action programs in the first place

Conceptual Problems

The central conceptual problem arises from the fact that while the new programs are essentially political and social in nature, evaluators tend to approach them as though they were standard efforts at educational change. This results in part from the fact that the programs themselves are ambiguous—since they are political endeavors in education, much of the surrounding rhetoric is educational. But it also results from the fact that evaluation researchers identify professionally and intellectually with their disciplines of origin (mostly education and psychology), and thus would rather not study politics.

Whatever the sources of this incongruence, it produces an inappropriate approach to evaluating the programs. The experience with Title I of ESEA is a good case in point. It has been in existence for about four years, and during that period the several national evaluations have been reported and these all have concentrated on one question: "Has the program as a whole improved achievement over what otherwise might have been expected?" The answer in each case has been negative, and not surprisingly this has led many to conclude that Title I the program is not "working?" Yet such a conclusion is possible only if two crucial assumptions about the program are accepted.

They are:

(a) Childrens' achievement test scores are a suitable criterion of the program's desired by school men and intended by Congress;

(b) The program exists in such a form that any such a summary over-all criterion of success is applicable.

Although each assumption can be tested empirically, there is no evidence that such tests have ever been made a pre-condition of any evaluation. In some respects, of course, this is understandable. Empirical tests of the first assumption for example, would involve a research program of unprecedented proportions. While educators regard achievement test scores as a suitable criterion of program success—on the theory that higher achievement leads to academic persistance, prolonged education, increased ability to perform complex occupational tasks, and better jobs and more money—there is little evidence one way or the other on this proposition. Of course, the same educators who subscribe to this view also argue that compensatory programs will have other beneficial effects; reducing vandalism; improving deportment; bettering citizenship; lowering truancy; and improving school-community relations. Some of these are doubtless valuable ends in themselves—less broken glass, for instance—but like achievement, most are included chiefly for the consequences they are presumed to have in adult life. There is, however, no more evidence on this than there is for achievement. The main long-range aims of compensatory education then, are impossible to directly measure by short-term program evaluation, for it has never been shown that the two have any actual connection.

But even if we disregard this scientific embarrassment, there is another major difficulty with the first assumption. Schoolmen must be expected to assume that the greater application of their efforts will improve students' lives, but there is no evidence that the Congress subscribed to that view by virtue of passing Title I of the 1965 ESEA.

Although the purposes of the Congress may be too complicated to be summarized in a national study of test scores, they are not by that token mysterious. The relevant Committee hearings and debates suggest that the legislative intent included several elements besides those already mentioned. One involved the rising political conflict over city schools in the early 1960's; no doubt many legislators felt that spreading money on troubled waters might bring peace. Another concerned an older liberal effort to provide Federal financial assistance for public education: the motives for this were mainly political and ideological, and were not intimately tied to achievement scores. A third involved the larger cities which were increasingly hard-pressed to maintain educational services which were competitive with other districts in their areas. Educators and other municipal officials were among the warmest friends of the new aid scheme because it would relieve some of the pressure on their revenues.

Thus the legislative intent concerning Title I embraced other elements besides achievement, i.e., improving educational services in school districts with many poor children; providing the central cities with some fiscal relief; reducing the discontent and conflict associated with race and poverty; and establishing the principle that the Federal government has some responsibility for local educational problems. The fact that these elements were embodied in a single piece of legislation probably contributed heavily to its passage, but they do not imply that the resulting program was single-purpose and homogeneous. Indeed, if any supposition was in order, it was precisely the opposite. The bill was typical of what we should expect of reform legislation in a large and diverse society with a Federal political system: it reflected various interests, and (for that reason) a variety of programmatic priorities.

It is one thing to identify the assumptions on which social action programs rest, and quite another to test them. In testing such assumptions, the methodological problems must be considered and concomitantly with the conceptual ones. For example, in order to determine whether Title I resulted in programs "which might reasonably be expected to improve achievement," one must first know what it is about schools that affect achievement; only then would it be possible to inspect Title I programs and determine if in fact they were doing the right things. The only difficulty is that when ESEA was passed almost nothing was known on this point: not a single proven strategy for raising achievement was extant. Prior efforts had been few, far between, and mostly failures. Title I, after all, was not the fruit of a systematic program of educational experimentation, but the expression of a paroxysm of concern. As a result, it is impossible to tell whether a given Title I program is likely to improve achievement, simply by inspecting the program; the only way to tell is by finding out whether in point of fact it *did* improve achievement.

Similarly, little is known about the process by which educational institutions change. This has been highlighted by the ability of many big-city school systems to absorb large amounts of activity and money designed to change them, and emerge apparently unchanged. If any question about the efficacy of social action programs is crucial, it is *how* such efforts at change succeed or fail. *The requirement here is not quantitative research, but sensitive political and social analysis, following the political and administrative history of social change programs.* It may be possible to learn as much about the sources of programs' success from studying the politics of their intent and execution as from analyzing the quantitative relationships between program components and some summary measure of target group performance.

These examples could be multiplied for other programs, but by this time the main point ought to be reasonably clear. Studies of *program realization* are an essential element in the evaluation of large-scale social action programs, because unlike neat treatments in small experiments, the aims of these large programs are diverse and often unclear. In fact, the notion of realization studies is based on the observation that reform legislation in a more or less pluralistic and open society will reflect diverse and sometimes conflicting purposes. Under such conditions, the first task of program evaluation is essentially political: it is to identify those purposes and determine the various ways in which they have been realized. The results of this process will yield evidence on the basis of which it is possible to determine the appropriateness of and conditions for further evaluation.

Once social action programs in education are seen for what they are—not experimental "treatments," but complex and often contradictory political undertakings—the rest follows. There are three broad areas at which evaluation should be directed:

(a) Definition of program aims and measurement of their implementation;

(b) Analytic studies of the dynamics of program implementation;

(c) Comparative studies of program efficiency.

The first of these categories includes investigations of whether a program improves achievement, as well as all the other criteria of realization which the diverse purposes of social action programs require. Despite its mainly quantitative character, such research is essentially comparative and historical: it seeks to determine whether a target population has changed its situation on particular educational indicators, where change is measured relative both to the same population before the program began, and to other, non-target populations. The issue here is not efficiency, but simply how much change occurred. Since the programs are large scale efforts in social action, evaluation must be large and diverse; it must cover and represent the available variation in the two populations, and monitor several program aims.

The second category includes those studies of the politics of program realization discussed just above. The focus of such research would be measures of program delivery, rather than some internal criterion of efficiency, and their purpose is to illuminate the political and administrative causes of variation in program realization. Although such studies would be inapplicable in traditional educational evaluation, they are crucial in the evaluation of social action programs; since these programs represent an effort to rearrange political relationships, the sources of variation in their realization are bound to be external (related to political and administrative matters), as well as internal (related to relative efficiency in the relationship between program inputs and outcomes).

The third category of studies, on the other hand, is focused on internal measures of program efficiency. In some cases—when it is appropriate to frame the issues in fiscal terms—these would take the form of benefit-cost analysis. There are, however, other measures of program efficiency in education— related both to program input and outcomes—to which comparative analyses are applicable. Benefit-cost analysis for example, might be concerned with the relative efficiency of several programs in producing achievement, but it is easy to imagine reasons for comparative studies of efficiency, say, in changing teachers' attitudes. In the first case the criterion of efficiency would be monetary, whereas in the second it might be other measures of educational effort, such as time or stress.

Political Problems

The evaluation of large-scale social action programs has been marked by a too-narrow definition of program aims, and an almost complete absence of program realization studies. As a result, evaluation have been almost uninterpretable. The real issue, however, is whether the resolution of these difficulties would provide an adequate basis for evaluation.

From the abstract perspective of evaluation schemes, one might be inclined to an affirmative answer. Given a more differentiated view of program aims, and careful program realization studies, Title I, for example, could be imagined as a satisfactory vehicle for research and development in compensatory education.

The only drawback with this idea is that the legislation did not envisage Title I in such a role. It is a major operating program, and several of its purposes have nothing to do with achievement. Therefore, activities in Washington designed to carry out systematic research and development would generate considerable opposition among recipient state and local educational agencies, and in the Congress. Research and development, after all, require that particular educational strategies be identified and carried out, and that their consequences be satisfactorily measured. Measurement is technically and politically the easiest of the two requirements, but even that has a dubious prospect. To date, the Office of Education has not tried to require that achievement tests be used in all Title I projects, a decision which program personnel feel is based on an accurate reading of political realities. Under these circumstances, it would be even more difficult to execute a particular set of educational strategies under Federal supervision in Title I districts.

This element in Title I, coupled with the existing distribution of political power in education, probably will deter effective national research and development work with Title I for some time. Such work is likely to occur—if at all—only in those States which for reasons of their own are committed to using the Federal funds for such purposes. The fact that selected States are currently collaborating in a new management data system offers some encouragement, but this project covers information, and has nothing to do with planning, executing, and monitoring educational strategies. The latter requires a much higher degree of commitment, partly because it costs more, but mostly because it produces much greater political opposition. There is, after all, more reason for State and district officials to oppose Federal involvement in planning local educational programs than there is for them to oppose Federal measurement of Federal programs.

The prospects for research and development with Title I can best be indicated by the fact that at the moment there isn't a single State which operates an R&D program in compensatory education. Thus, while the new information system may produce information on the characteristics of successful programs, it seems unlikely that even within States it will offer an opportunity for systematic research on and development of successful strategies.

The underlying reason for this is political. Research and development work involves elements of the experimental approach, and effective use of that approach requires a degree of control over the main variables which seems incompatible with the other purposes of Title I. The question, then, is whether other programs offer a better prospect for research and development in compensatory education.

Our effort to develop educational strategies based on "planned variation" of different program approaches has evolved in the Follow-Through Program of the Office of Education. Following a 1968 report on Child Development (produced by a White House Task Force) OE in the early spring of 1968 converted its new Follow-Through on Head Start to an R&D effort aimed at the determination of which early childhood programs in the K–3 complex would have greatest success working with disadvantaged children in various community settings throughout the nation. Underlying this strategy is the assumption that useful experience was most likely to result from more systematic efforts to try out several strategies at once, under a variety of school and community conditions. In this way answers to the standard evaluation questions could be gotten at the same time as answer to the comparative (benefit-cost) questions.

Since this approach has been in effect only one school year it would be unwise to essay any judgments about the strategies or their impact upon achievement. The Follow-Through program is designed to provide answers to two questions:

(a) Which of the strategies improves achievement over what might otherwise be expected?

(b) What is the relative efficiency of the several strategies in improving achievement?

Answers to these questions await the results of national evaluation studies now underway—the largest of these being under the direction of the Stanford Research Institute.

The experience thus far suggests that as things presently stand, there are three major obstacles to a national experimental approach to evaluation and comparative studies are:

(a) Fiscal—lack of money to produce adequate sample sizes;

(b) Political—lack of authority to assign schools and/or districts to treatment or control groups;

(c) Administrative—lack of staff required to deal effectively with the logistics of a large program.

Experimental approaches are subject to two primitive political problems: one is that the educational system is almost completely decentralized, (at least from a national perspective), and Federal experimentation must conform to this pattern; the other is that the resources allocated to programs designed to eliminate educational disadvantaged are small when compared to other Federal priorities. This is a token of the relatively low political investment in such efforts which the government currently is willing to make. The consequence of the first problem is that Federal efforts to experiment begin with a grave deficit in the political and fiscal power required to mount them, and the implication of the second is that there is scant evidence of much new money or more power with which to redress this imbalance.

Chapter VII.—The Federal role in urban education: limits and obligations

In Chapter VI, we dealt with the several facets of the evaluation problem which have resulted from the more recent Federal programs with their broad social-action thrusts. In dealing with this problem, we have already, by implication, begun describing what some of the newly developing dimensions of the Federal role are. Specifically, they are: (1) to foster institutional change for the improvement of economic, social, health, and educational conditions of large numbers of our impoverished fellow citizens; (2) to provide increased monies for such programs; and (3) as a result of (1) and (2), to provide de facto advocacy on behalf of impoverished children and adults. Now, beginning to evolve on a larger scale than ever before are the Federal efforts with regard to educating impoverished children.

These dimensions of the Federal role have not been effortlessly evolved. Rather, they have been hammered out on the anvil of the political realities of pressure groups, regional and local interests and needs, social ferment, prejudice, and general resistance to change. And, as the growing activism of the Federal role emerges in education, concern is expressed over the changes which may be—or are—taking place in traditional Federal, State, and local roles.

With these considerations in mind, this chapter considers first, the limits of the Federal role in education; and, second, the obligations which the Federal government has to impoverished citizens in urban areas with regard to education

The Limits of the Federal Role

Federal financial and substantive participation in education programs has increased marketdly over the past five years. The legislative breakthroughs of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, combined with various programs of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, have resulted in a new posture in education for the Federal Government. It has been described as a new "Junior Partnership" with State and local governments by a former U.S. Commissioner of Education. These acts and their potential

for educational progress have caused a ferment of expectation on the ultimate scope and direction of the new Federal role in education. Arising from this ferment is a recent manifestation of public disappointment that the new laws have not wrought the educational miracles which are needed to achieve educational quality and equality for our disadvantaged groups. One source of resentment concerns the Federal failures to fulfill the dollar authorizations of the new Acts with appropriations which match the amounts authorized. As the hastily formed Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Educational Programs stated for the debate on the House floor in July 1969 the Federal Government authorized (i.e., promised) 9 billions of dollars with its laws but delivered only 3 billions with its budget (see page 7–12).

A major surprise was achieved when the pressures mounted behind this Committee's campaign produced an unprecedented reversal not only of the Administration budgetary forces, but of the all-powerful House Committee on Appropriations, by adding close to $1 billion to the fiscal year 1969–70 appropriation bill for educational programs as it rode through the House. Thus a new chapter has been added to that mentioned earlier. First Administration and Congressional forces placed on the statute books a legislative mandate calling for Federal funds to be placed on the doorstep of every school and college in America for the delivery of improved services to youth. Next the allied groups representing educational interests delivered a telling message that they had the power to push the Congress into a funding action that would have previously been considered impossible. The net effect is an assumption (at least a political assumption) that the Federal role will continue to grow and that the Federal programs are sufficiently important to create across-the-board political action to achieve more adequate funding of them.

While a Federal role is emerging in law, more sharply than might have been earlier predicted, a growing realization persists that local problems are not yielding to the legislative solutions designed by the Congress. Public despair with educational progress for poor and minority group populations has led to questions of the magnitude of Federal leverage that will be required to bring about institutional change in the educational system. As programs multiply on the local scene, the continuing decline of achievement scores in the inner city causes public concern and doubt. As the Federal slice of the education budget grows the question arises "how much difference is the Federal dollar making?" The answers are difficult to come by. The principal political concern centers on the issue of "categorical" aid vs. "block grants" or "general aid." The principal public concern is whether Federal dollars can bring about needed improvements in pupil achievement. Economists argue that we should not invest heavily in educational programs until we find out "what works" and can be assured of commensurate return for the Federal investment. Educators argue that we have never really given them a chance to prove their ability to deliver educational success because we have limited their resources and forced them into diluted programs.

The impasse that emerges from this conundrum is that the character of program leadership from Washington may shift in either of two directions. One choice is for greater Federal concern for producing tangible educational outcomes for those pupils who are being rejected by the system. The other choice lies in the direction of calculated funding of "the system" to provide the essential public finance, and to allow the local schools to worry about producing needed results. Whether a middle course can be charted is another question.

For the urban areas, the stakes are very high since they are at the mercy of unsympathetic State legislatures. Also, they are caught in the undertow of the growing disabling confluence of immigrant poor pupils and an exodus of middle class taxpayers. They are also striving for political recognition by the Federal Government in the face of a growing Federal apathy toward "solving" urban problems.

However, the Federal Government can only drift—it cannot retreat. It is politically impossible as well as humanly unthinkable for the Federal Government to turn its back on the millions of children it has offered to help through its new programs serving the disadvantaged. What the Federal Government really must decide is not whether to withdraw, or even whether to enlarge its role in the educational system—the real question is whether the Federal Government has the skill and determination to remake its programs in ways that will solve urgent national problems of social progress and human survival. For our inner cities the question is more simple and stark—life or death for its children.

Urban Education—A National Problem

As was stated in chapter I, the salvation of urban education is a problem of national dimensions. All our cities suffer from the same complex of social, political, and economical forces which impinge on the ability of our schools and colleges to produce an acceptable educational product. Since our great cities are the economic and social mainspring of modern living, their educational salvation becomes a problem that transcends State boundaries and political traditions.

The problem of an inadequate education which faces an inner city child and his parents is the problem of the Nation. We believe that the Federal Government must assume a role in solving that problem. The inequities of the education of impoverished urban students exact a disastrous toll. They cripple the individual youngster's chance for success, happiness, and usefulness. In their wake, his family, community, city and nation are denied his potential contribution. We must now face our unmet obligation. This urgent obligation must be met not only in moral and human terms, but also in financial terms.

An education which produces the effects described above is worthless, and ultimately disastrously expensive. Not only is the money which financed it wasted, but we shall continue to pay for its results. If the dropouts of the present system become delinquents or criminals, they become financial liabilities. If they have a family—but no job—they become welfare liabilities.

It is patently obvious to any student of government that the Federal Government has responded to specific crises in various sectors of the economy. The best example is the agriculture industry which supports a small number of farmers with higher consumer prices and revenue collected from nationwide income taxes. No less supported are the builders of the merchant marine fleet. Where it is in the national interest to solve a particular problem, the national Government has previously sought to solve that problem. Further, the solution of that problem benefits not only the nonwhite and the city but the entire country as well.

From a completely practical standpoint—idealism aside, Federal investment in education can be an extremely profitable venture, in that money that was formerly spent for programs, such as welfare, stronger police forces, and other preventive or stop-gap measures could be freed for spending in other areas, since educational programs create revenue and jobs. The costs of *not* educating people to take responsible positions in society are striking.

TABLE I.—MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND POLICE PROTECTION, 1967

[In millions of dollars]

City	Welfare expenditure	Police protection
New York	558.4	292.1
Chicago	10.2	93.1
Los Angeles	.2	70.6
Philadelphia	11.3	47.7
Detroit	19.8	41.0
Baltimore	50.8	25.9
Houston		12.5
Cleveland	1.9	17.6
Washington, D.C.	35.1	30.8
St. Louis	1.1	22.5
San Francisco	61.1	20.3
Milwaukee		17.4
Boston	61.7	22.1

Source: Statistical Abstracts, 1968, Table 602, City Government Expenditures.

The Municipal Expenditures cited in Table 1, overpage, are actually only a small portion of the money that is spent for such purposes. In 1967, the Federal Government paid out a total of $9,868,217,000 to the states for public assistance alone. This figure is equivalent to more than twice what the government spent in *all* education programs in that same fiscal year. (The total government spending in education in 1967 was $4,047,000,000.)

In terms of welfare payments, the Federal Government will provide a yearly average of $515 per recipient. As of January 1969, there were 6.1 million people on welfare,[28] with a resulting average Federal welfare bill of 3.1 billion dollars. An individual on welfare for the period of his working life will cost the country approximately $25,000.

These substantial welfare expenditures by the Federal Government offer little if any return on the investment. Welfare cannot be regarded as more than stopgap measure to solve the problems of poverty. Expenditures in education could have the direct effect of lowering welfare costs, by educating people, getting them off the welfare rolls and into the occupational structure. Aside from the financial benefits of such action, it is impossible to measure the saving in terms of the effects on the individual lives involved and the ultimate reduction in human conflict. And in the end, this prosperity that is created by the introduction of such programs can also be shared by the local citizen; for, as spending and employment increase, so will the GNP, and tax revenue and Federal grants will be available for use on other essential programs.

Education is an investment in the future of the individual and in the future of the country. He will, in all probability, be adequately employed, and thus a financial asset through his payment of income taxes. In terms of job training programs, the majority of which are designed for high school dropouts, the government will spend another 3.5 billion dollars in 1970 (*Federal Manpower Programs,* 1969, p. 135). In terms of prison costs and rehabilitation, the government pays $3,760 a year per adult in a reformatory and another $1,200 to train him.[29] A high school graduate may be expected to earn an average of $7,494 a year; a college graduate, $11,135 (U.S. Office of Education, 1968, p. 15). Together they will pay back to the government in Federal taxes approximately $90,000 during their working lives.[30] Education is the key to the chance for an individual to become a $25,000 welfare liability, or to become a $90,000 taxpaying asset. We cannot afford the cost of failing to meet our obligation.

Another factor which points to the Federal government assuming a role in solving the problem of urban education is that the local and state governments simply cannot do the job alone. Education must compete with all of the other urban problems, like housing,

Footnotes at end of article.

health, traffic congestion, air pollution, for attention from city governments which face crises in meeting their operating budgets.

No one knows how to meet any of these problems without spending massive sums of money. The property and sales taxes on which states and localities rely so heavily are pitifully insufficient. The hope, then, must come from Washington. The Federal income tax with all its faults does keep pace with the growth of the economy much better than the sales or property taxes.

The Nixon Administration has made a move toward helping state and local governments with its revenue sharing plan. However, if enacted, it would not help the big cities or urban education significantly. The proposal contains no satisfactory pass-through mechanism to get the money to the cities, and there are assurances for educational support from whatever does come through their pipelines. If urban education deserves priority attention, and we strongly believe that it does, it must come in the form of direct aid from Washington to the cities.

President Nixon's Task Force on Education urged such Federal effort on behalf of urban education in its report:

"We believe that . . . this (urban education) is one of the areas of education where the Federal Government has a special responsibility for direct intervention and one to which the new administration must devote a substantial portion of its attention." (President Nixon's Task Force on Urban Education, 1969, H 1661).

A Federal effort in urban education would be in keeping with such past efforts such as the Morrill Act, which 100 years ago responded to the need for a system of higher education in this country, and the National Defense Education Act, passed after the Soviet launching of Sputnik and designed to compensate for deficiencies in science, math, and language programs in American schools.

The crisis in urban education must be confronted. It is obvious that we cannot afford the financial and social burden that presently exists. We cannot afford the growing animosities and tension between blacks and whites in our cities and across the land. If it is agreed that the foremost socializing agency in the nation is the school system, then that is where an attack upon the problem must begin and the solution, at least in part, must reside.

PART III—A PLAN FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Overview

The Task Force submits as its major recommendation that the Office of Education develop special landmark legislation, such as an Urban Education Act, which will be designed to fund the planning, development, and implementation of a comprehensive master plan to meet the specific, long-range, broadly conceived educational needs of inner-city areas. As an interim measure, the Task Force further recommends that the Office of Education immediately consolidate programs for impoverished groups under an Associate Commissioner for Programs serving the Disadvantaged. This Office or Bureau should: supervise the implementation of the short-term recommendations of this Task Force Report; conduct a critical examination of current programs dealing with education in the cities; modify and administer these programs; provide technical assistance to them; design such long-range landmark legislation as the Task Force recommends; and prepare to administer such legislation upon its passage. As the development of new program authorization permits (e.g., an urban education act or new categorical programs), a new Bureau of Urban Education should be created with a clear mandate to operate programs and to establish Officewide priorities for efficiently meeting urban educational needs in all OE programs.

Accordingly, Part Three of this report discusses the long-term recommendation for the development of an Urban Education Act in four successive chapters and the short-term recommendations are presented in the last chapter. The chapters are as follows:

Chapter VIII—An Urban Education Act—The Educational Program.—This chapter deals with the type of education program which would be the major focus of a comprehensive urban master plan. The Task Force would hope to see the components of such an educational program specified in the legislation or contained in administrative guidelines.

Chapter IX—An Urban Education Act—The Authority Structure.—The question of authority is discussed on all levels: local, city, metropolitan, State and Federal. Federal reorganization designed to establish a Bureau of Urban Education is discussed in this chapter.

Chapter X—An Urban Education Act—The Funding Process.—This chapter discusses the funding process, including the determination of grantees, e.g., cities, local education agencies, non-public schools, and competitive alternative agencies. Funding to States, as well as a potential funding by-pass to cities is also covered here.

Chapter XI—An Urban Education Act—The Cost.—This chapter delineates the cost of the recommended programs.

Chapter XII—Short-term Recommendations.—This chapter will discuss measures which either relate to existing legislation or which may be taken without introduction to new legislation.

The Task Force wishes to underscore its conviction as to the urgency for immediacy in implementing both its recommendation for landmark legislation with long-range impact and its short-term recommendations. (The short-term recommendations are regarded by the Task Force as crucial and minimal to hold current educational systems together.)

Chapter VIII. An urban education act—The education program

The Task Force recommends that special legislation be developed, to be called the Urban Education Act. As a major section of the Act, the Task Force recommends the inclusion of a comprehensive master plan concept for urban education. This section should make provision for duly constituted agencies and groups (detailed in Chapter IX) to develop comprehensive master plan proposals for the redesign of educational programs and supportive services with special emphasis or inner city and suburban students who are impoverished. Also included in this section of the Act should be both the kinds of characteristics and the sequencing which any master plan submitted by a potential urban grantee should possess. Finally, this section should include provision for grantees other than those eligible under the master plan and the characteristics of programs funded as alternatives.

Accordingly, this chapter describes the scope and orientation or philosophy of the master plan, the levels which this plan should encompass, and the components which should be included at all its levels. Also described is the rationale and characteristics of an alternative plan to the master plan.

The Scope and Orientation of the Master Plan

The master plan must reflect the broadest and most enriched concept of education and relate its projected educational program to other special urban concerns, such as integration, housing, health, and employment. To isolate the urban education program from its environment or context would be setting the stage for irrelevance in the neighborhood school program and for inadequate responses to special needs of impoverished students at the policy and senior administrative levels.

Furthermore, merely equalizing the educational resources between city and suburb will not accomplish the goal of providing impoverished students with the quality education they need. To prepare this student for full participation in the life of our nation, he must be provided with an education that is dramatically superior to that in the suburbs. This education must prepare him to enter the economic and social mainstream of American life without losing his individuality and concomitantly prepare those already in the mainstream to accept his individuality and diversity as positive contributions to it.

To achieve this superior education for the impoverished urban student:

"The educative process must be truly expanded in its focus to the whole individual at all educational levels. . . . His health, his emotional well-being, his intellectual capacities, his future employment, his self-realization are thus all involved in the process. . . . New areas must be included which are of special significance for the urban student, such as problems of narcotics addiction, noise, overcrowding, and maintenance of individuality." (UETF Report, Ch. I, p. 1-7).

In order to insure that a master plan submitted by a potential grantee reflects a broadened concept of education and an enriched supporting program, general criteria should be established. These criteria should either be contained within the legislation itself or specifically assigned in it to the Commissioner of Education to develop in concert with representatives from other urban and urban-related agencies. Placing such criteria within the legislation itself in general terms would presumably give more weight to subsequent and more detailed regulations and administrative statements dealing with possible future problems of compliance than might be available if administratively developed. Moreover, if generally stated in the legislation, there should be sufficient flexibility to make adjustments administratively as needed after urban education programs have come into existence. To be avoided for either alternative is the creation of a monolithic set of criteria which only consider the common characteristics of urban areas and fail to take into account their unique characteristics.

Bearing in mind the above caveat, the majority of the Task Force recommends the establishment of a set of general programmatic criteria both to be followed by the potential grantees in developing their master plans for urban education and to be applied by the grantor in: (1) assisting potential grantees in developing their proposals; (2) in judging the quality of these proposals; and (3) in working with the grantees in implementing these proposals. These general criteria should include the following features:

1. A clear and broadly conceived *definition* of what education in the urban setting should accomplish is imperative. This definition should overarch and thus link together all of the specific phases and components of the urban education program. Parents and youth of the neighborhood communities participating in the program should also contribute to formulating this definition since they will be experiencing its effects in various ways over extended periods of time. Moreover, this definition should avoid the pejorative distinction often made between education and training. The educative process must encompass both so that the participating students will acquire a valid *and* saleable education in the sense of becoming fully self-respecting, rationale, and economically sufficient human beings and citizens. Specifically, the majority positions of the Task Force as detailed in Chapter I lead to a definition of education which

embodies the concept that all of the individuals participating in the program at any level and in any role are active and continuous partners in the educative process which can—and does—take place anytime and anywhere. This concept implies that heretofore largely unrecognized partners—parents, local community residents, and students—must be involved in the decision-making about what is to be learned, and why it should be learned. The extent of student decision-making would, of course, vary with age, but it should nevertheless begin with the earliest age of entry into the program. With such involvement in the decision-making process comes both the need and the responsibility for knowing the options and the probable consequences of these options, the joint setting of goals which are understood by all participants, and the identification of the best strategies to reach these goals. Moreover, this decision-making requires clear statements of goals to be accomplished and the sequencing of behaviors required for their accomplishment

2. A clearly articulated statement of need which includes: (a) a description of the community environment(s) in which the program will be based; (b) descriptions of target populations to be served; (c) the development of the priorities or needs which identifies the relative degree of urgency of the problems facing the urban area which relate directly and indirectly to education; (d) inadequacies within the presently existing educational programs in the urban area; (e) a description of how the proposed new plan will met the priority needs of the target population and effect necessary educational system and related institutional changes; and (f) the difference between financial resources presently available at the State and local levels and those needed from the Federal level to successfully implement the plan.

3. The plans for utilizing financial resources from all available sources, including Federal, State, local and private sources. These plans should detail the sources and amounts of funds as well as their anticipated use in the program.

4. The plans for utilizing existing and heretofore largely unutilized instructional and human resources, e.g., private business and industrial facilities and services, cultural institutions, governmental agencies at various levels, (Federal, State, and local), the diverse human potential within both the city-at-large and a particular community. The use of these resources can take a wide variety of patterns ranging from voluntary contributions in the form of services, equipment, and space to subcontracting out whole aspects or levels of the educational program. The following example are briefly illustrative.

In the voluntary area, there are such possibilities as teaching an art program in a nearby gallery with local artists doing the teaching or supplementing the school instructors; of teaching measurement in a factory making precision instruments, in a bakery, in a dress-making or interior decorating shop; teaching reading to functionally illiterate adults with qualified personnel drawn from the school system or local universities using want ads, driving manuals, bus schedules, labels on food products, and credit contracts; etc. In the subcontracting area, there are such possibilities as computer programming and keypunching, automobile mechanics training, carpentry; and early childhood education program being operated in leased commercial space; para-professional training program; street academy for dropouts and other young adults; work-study programs run by local universities at the secondary level to prepare teenagers for successful undergraduate performance; etc.

5. A general set of objectives or aims to be pursued to solve those problems which have direct bearing on the process of education, e.g., housing, employment, health, integration, etc. Such objectives should strive to be met by phases of the funded master plan and by utilization of and coordination with other Federal, State, and local authorities. The local educational agency will need to develop these broad objectives in conjunction with these other agencies as well as within whatever legal contraints are involved. A consolidated set of general objectives with a timetable and a commitment for mutually accomplishing them should hopefully afford a coordinated approach to these education-related problems.

6. A specific set of educational objectives to be met by the educational program of the master plan clearly stated in terms of what the student in each educational developmental level is expected to learn, acquire, and/or manifest as a result of the comprehensive program provided. Such objectives should be oriented to student performance which can be measured in some form of overt behavior.

7. A full description of the program which will be developed and implemented to accomplish the objectives in points 4 and 5 above. The education program description should include the following components at a minimum: a) planning, b) personnel or staff development at all levels, c) curriculum, d) supportive services, e) community involvement, f) experimentation, g) assessment, and h) facilities. These components are described in detail in a subsequent section of this chapter.

8. The plan for adequately evaluating the master plan program in each community with respect to the performance of institutions in general and specific key roleholders within them in bringing about change and improvement. Such evaluation plans should include the utilization of the assessment component of the education program in relation to all other components of the education program beginning with the first stages of the planning and including estimates of student performance and the general educational performance in each community.

Levels of the Educational Program

As stated above, the Task Force recommends that the master plan be developed to encompass all educational levels from early childhood through adult. In determining priorities in terms of developmental levels, the Task Force suggests the following level designations and their definitions:

1. Early childhood—from prenatal to nine years of age (preschool through 4th grades).

2. Middle childhood—from ten to thirteen years of age (5th through 8th grades, including some "occupational readiness").

3. Secondary—from fourteen through eighteen (9th through 12th grades, and including "occupational readiness" and training).

4. Higher education—eighteen and up (while in college or other form of post-secondary education, including occupational readiness).

5. Adult (training taken after a lapse of time from secondary or higher education, often requiring occupatibnal readiness and training).

The Task Force felt that a rationale could be developed to give first priority to the consideration of any one of the above-noted levels. Therefore, we recommend that through the development of a comprehensive program which if articulated at each level to the next, then all levels will be considered as having an equal priority. This position represented the sense of the Task Force members present although a considerable number of the members felt that the early childhood should receive the greatest emphasis.

The Task Force suggests that priorities can be imposed only when considered from long- or short-range perspectives. To illustrate: If viewed from the perspective of long-range results, early childhood education would receive priority emphasis in order that a child from birth could be educated to his fullest potential and in order that his education might progressively equip him to most effectively negotiate the society for which he is being prepared. This reasoning proceeds from the up-and-out in one generation perspective. If viewed from the perspective of short-term results, secondary level would receive priority in order that the current high school students of the cities emerge motivated and prepared to acquire higher education or vocational training to become sorely needed educated members of society. We can afford no gap of educated inner city students in leadership positions while we await the emergence into society of those students now in early childhood phases. Also, higher education is an important immediate priority since program modifications and/or new programs must have appropriately trained personnel to operate them.

Educational Program Components

As mentioned above in the section, *The Scope of the Master Plan*, the Task Force recommends that the educational program of the master plan should include at a minimum the following program and program-related components defined below. The order of listing does *not* imply a statement of priority, except with regard to planning.

Planning

Crucial to the successful implementation of any educational program component is a deliberate and comprehensive plan which has been developed with sufficient lead time and which at various stages in its development has involved appropriate persons representing the community, the public and private educational agencies at State and local levels, USOE, private industry within the urban area and the State and local governments. The planning component itself should not phase out as the program components become operational. Rather this component, in conjunction with that of assessment, should become the cutting edge of the master program, i.e., it should be out "in front" of program in anticipating its needs, personnel, training, and the like. Its operations should specifically include continuous planning, modifications, and/or redesign as feedback becomes available from the operating components. Hence, the planning component should have phases to it (e.g., initial design, preliminary implementation, feedback, modification, and the like), but the phases will as the program becomes fully operational take on a cyclical character.

During the initial design phases, the development of framework for the master program becomes critical, and should include such aspects as: the setting of priorities based on a wide range of inputs from such sources as parents, community leaders, teachers, administrators, etc.; a clear set of performance objectives stated in terms of overt student behaviors; funding requirements and anticipated costs; preparation of a plan for in-service training in critical areas; designation of schools to be involved; joint planning with other social agencies; etc. While we feel that the specific objectives should be defined locally, we recommend that specific objectives be conceived within a framework that considers the following concerns.

Integration

The planning framework should assume integration as a vital aspect of and means to a full education. The Task Force agrees with and fully endorses Commissioner Allen's goal "to provide an equal educational opportunity for all in a racially and socially integrated society." (To achieve this equal educational opportunity, urban education financially and programmatically must be superior.) We further recommend that systematic integration plans must be a part of the master plan. Studies have shown that when children from low-income minority families are integrated

with middle or upper class white children, achievement does improve. Even more important is the finding that when children of different backgrounds with different values associate with one another attitudes and outlooks are bound to modify and broaden.

However, for significant integration to occur there must be a substantial, genuine voluntary mix of students and staff. Unfortunately, this prerequisite makes it impossible for integration to work on a large scale in most urban areas. There are simply not enough whites in the inner city to go around. Nor have whites been particularly willing to give up their advantages to do something about inner city education. We recognize the seeming paradox of attempting to achieve integration with the current thrust of decentralization and community control which in some instances seem to perpetuate existing patterns of racial isolation.

However, this thrust by no means precludes integration. Integration is, in fact, a natural byproduct of many smaller experiments in community control of schools. Washington's Adams-Morgan Community School, for example, began as an effort to bring an economically and racially diverse neighborhood together so that programs could be developed to meet the root causes of its social problems. Its students, faculty, and governing board are integrated. At Ocean Hill-Brownsville over 70% of the teaching staff happens to be white. The Store Front Learning Center, also located in the heart of Roxbury, reflects the surrounding community and is primarily a mix of Spanish-speaking black and white children and teachers.

The emerging interdependency thrust has the potential for developing new patterns of integration. For example, the Anacostia Community School Project is making efforts to draw in the larger community as well as the resource of the Public Schools of D.C. The new Federal City College, also located in D.C., manifests the same thrust although reflected in somewhat different ways.

Integration is feasible through other approaches as well. Schools in smaller cities which have a majority white population should be reorganized along racial lines. All schools in the district may be used and qualified educational personnel redistributed among the schools. In recent years several cities with population ranging from 100,000 to 300,000 have desegregated their school systems. Examples of desegregation efforts in such cities as Berkeley, with 125,000 people with a school population 41 percent black, and Evanston, with a total population of 88,000 of which 22 percent is black, should be studied by cities of like size and composition. Educational parks, great high schools, which involve the concept of metropolitan planning in education are a logical next step for those areas which have successfully tried an integrated approach on a small scale.

In short, we recommend that: 1) in addition to holding the objective of integration in the long run, any immediate steps toward this goal which are feasible should be taken; 2) regardless of what form integration in the inner city takes—and it may not be immediately feasible—we must provide for the disadvantaged urban student an education which is dramatically superior to that in the suburbs in order to recompense that student for an education which to date has failed him. We must provide an education which will prepare him to negotiate the mainstream, and which will in time attract all races and all social strata to share in a process superior to the one they are currently experiencing.

Institutional Change

Also, within the planning component, specific program and student performance-oriented objectives should be conceived within a framework that assumes *institutional change* as an urgent necessity—not change for the sake of change—but the implementation of new educational structures, roles, materials, training programs, and the like, which have been proven more effective toward the successful education of students than those currently in practice or use. Plans should indicate what conditions or areas call for institutional changes, what kinds of institutional changes are anticipated, how they will be achieved, the nature of opposition to and/or support for these changes, the schedule by which they will be accomplished, and the criteria for measuring the extent and magnitude of the anticipated changes.

Gains for total community through wide use of resources.—The framework should take into account not only educational gains for the student but also for the community as a whole. A set of performance objectives for students if well conceived and successfully met will yield byproducts for the entire urban community in such areas as employment, cultural enrichmant, and dollar impact. The planning framework itself must be a dynamic and expanding one. In order to meet student performance objectives, new authorities must be developed and new resources tapped which will contribute to future planning and implementation of programs.

Pre-grant performance.—Plans should include a report of those components which have been developed, implemented and tested since they are the ones on which the success of the master plan is predicated. Without prohibiting newly created organizations from receiving funds under an urban education act, planners should generally be required to use existing funds to demonstrate performance prior to receiving developmental and operational funds.

Personnel Development

One of the most crucial elements of any comprehensive plan to make the schools in our cities more responsive to their students and to better prepare them to deal with our complex society is a basic and far-reaching reform in the approach to educational personnel development. By *personnel* is meant administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, non-professionals and community volunteers. By *development* is meant continuous preservice and inservice programs at the local, city, State and Federal levels for all persons involved in educational activities. Specifically, these programs should be designed for and carried out in inner-city educational settings. Included in such programs should be:

1. The acquisition of appropriate attitudes and strategies for working with inner-city students.
2. Preparation for process-centered learning rather than textbook-centered learning.
3. The full utilization of the life experiences of the students as significant content for process learning.
4. The techniques for involving community residents and other resources in the educative process.
5. Cooperative work with supportive services staffing, e.g., nutritionist, psychologist.
6. The flexible and maximal use of educational settings—both traditional (e.g., the regular school) and a traditional (e.g., streets, businesses) within the community for the educative process.

A good teacher is usually the major key to a successful educational program. Yet in our inner-city schools we all too often find new and inexperienced teachers, or substitute teachers. We also find teachers who have received their teacher training in middle-class oriented institutions and who, as a result, have developed negative attitudes toward the potential of the disadvantaged child of the urban ghetto. When we do find dedicated teachers, they are often hampered by inadequate educational material, by an inflexible curriculum, by inappropriate preservice education, or by a lack of any salary incentive to remain in an urban school rather than move to the suburbs or drop out of teaching altogether. Actually, if we take into account all of these factors—low salaries, inadequate preparation, low status, inappropriate curriculum, and the inadequate tools given to teachers to accomplish the monumental task expected of them by society—educational personnel are probably performing better than the society has a right to expect.

Yet this is small consolation in the face of the urgent demand for more effective schools and for a more effective educative process which is linked to the real lives of students. A basic reform is required. Students in our cities have a right to: (1) expect teachers who understand and appreciate their cultural heritage, their socio-economic problems, and their individual life styles; (2) expect teachers who possess a positive attitude toward their learning ability, who are able to make use of the students' varying values, even though they differ from the teachers' values; (3) be taught by teachers who can function as team leaders and who can draw experiences into the learning situations that will make it community-centered learning; (4) find in their teachers a sensitivity to individuals which is reflected when they encourage each student according to his ability and interest; and (5) have teachers competently knowledgeable in their respective subject-matter areas.

We see this basic reform occurring in three major areas: (1) recruitment; (2) training programs; and (3) staff development. The main responsibility for beginning to develop new approaches to recruitment and staff development rests with the school systems. These new approaches should be spelled out in the plan. Renewal of teacher training programs must be a cooperative venture between colleges and the schools.

Recruitment.—School systems should initiate programs which will provide incentives and inducements for attracting capable and competent persons to enter urban school systems, especially those from poor and ethnic minority backgrounds.

One type of program would be an arrangement whereby the school system would hire a beginning teacher and in cooperation with a college or university develop a special graduate training program tailored to his needs, and would also pay for the teacher's graduate training. Another program would be the recruitment of returned Peace Corps and VISTA workers, accompanied by special orientation and training programs. There could be programs established which focus on hiring and preparing persons who have college degrees and have been employed in other fields but who now want to enter the teaching profession. Another obvious approach would be to send young, attractive articulate teachers from the school system to recruit additional staff members from colleges and universities.

Another essential part of the recruitment program should be the effort to attract residents of the communities served by the schools, especially the poor, into new careers in the education profession. The involvement of community residents in school programs has already been shown to have a positive effect on the learning of the students and has assisted, in many instances in overcoming the students' alienation from teachers and administrators. In addition these new career opportunities will help to meet the manpower crisis in the teaching profession and will allow for greater flexibility and differentiation in staff organization.

The new career opportunities offered to community residents should be more than simply secretarial or clerical. There should be an adequate orientation program to enable these paraprofessionals to function effectively in the classroom as part of the instructional team. In addition, training and

education should be built into their work situation to enable them to advance into a permanent position in the professional teaching ranks.

Training programs.—If a comprehensive education plan directed to the needs of the disadvantaged child is to be effective, teacher training programs must concentrate on changing the attitudes of teachers and preparing them to effectively employ new ideas and educational materials quite different from those methods and materials which might be employed in a typical suburban school.

We recommend, therefore, that a separate title of the Urban Education Act be written which would fund specific types of teacher training programs to accomplish the above objectives. These programs would have to be operated in colleges or universities located in or adjacent to the urban areas which receive funds under the terms of the Urban Education Act.

The programs approved for funding by the Assistant Secretary/Commissioner of Education would have to be based on a reconnection between the teacher training institutions and the communities which the teachers will serve. The institutions will need to ask the urban communities what their goals are in terms of the kinds of teachers they feel are needed in their schools. And they will need to design special student teaching experiences approved by the community and which take place in the city. In addition, university professors must come to understand, experientially, the actual problems that school teachers face daily in the classroom in order to help them arrive at better approaches to teaching.

Necessary elements of any program must be courses such as urban sociology, cultural anthropology, and the psychology of the disadvantaged, experience in working with highly aggressive students, and a working knowledge of behavior therapy in preparation for conflict situations likely to occur between the values of staff personnel and students from urban areas. In addition, pertinent faculties outside the school or department of education must also contribute to the work of effectively preparing teachers for our urban schools.

Finally, this teacher training title of the Act should provide funds for experimental approaches in the area of teacher preparation apart from colleges and universities. These approaches could take the form of new training centers either publicly operated by a school system, or privately operated by a profit or nonprofit organization. The centers would be located in the ghetto as autonomous units and should be accredited by the State.

Such experimental approaches should be operated on two basic premises: (1) that training should take place in the local community rather than on college campuses; and (2) that the community (including community service agencies and other local groups) should have a major part in the planning and implementation of the training programs and in the policy decisions.

Staff development.—Urban school systems have a prime responsibility for constantly improving the quality of teaching in their system through staff development programs which aim at increasing the subject matter competence of teachers and their skill in teaching children. Such programs must be an integral component of any comprehensive plan to meet the educational needs of the cities.

We believe that if this in-service phase of teacher training is to have a significant impact on the urban school system, then programs must be implemented which orient themselves to the individual schools within that school system. In-service training which attempts to reorganize the teaching methods of the entire school system can become either quite overwhelming or just procrustean.

We, therefore, recommend a staff development approach (similar to that proposed by the Training Task Force) which takes place at the local school level and involves the whole staff of the school. In this approach the principal of the individual school would play a special role in his ability to coordinate and relate new educational methods and materials in a curriculum design appropriate for particular character of the students and teachers of his school.

More importantly, teachers themselves would be involved and would share a major responsibility for the process of school's development. Obviously, adequate time would have to be provided in the school day for the teachers to carry out this in-service program; it is not an extra to be tacked on at the end of the day in the classroom. This approach to staff development would be seen as a part of their professional life on the job.

Teachers and the para professionals in the schools would carry out an analysis and evaluation of the unique characteristics and strengths of their students, as well as the learning problems peculiar to these students. Then they would decide on the types of teaching approaches, sequences of learning tasks, and instructional materials that would most effectively meet these learning needs. In this process, they would be actively aided by their own students, as well as by parents, citizens, university specialists, central staff personnel and other community resources.

We believe that by decentralizing in-service teacher development, new approaches to education can more effectively and more rapidly reach the classrooms of the urban schools and begin positively to influence the learning process of the impoverished urban student.

Also, any adequate staff development program for an entire school system must be aimed at administrators and school board members as well. Principals and other administrative officers in the school systems who often were promoted to these positions because they were good teachers, should receive training in efficient management techniques. Present and potential school board members, at both the city and the community levels, should also be given the kind of orientation which will enable them to function in their role as educational decision-makers.

Curriculum

Curriculum is defined here as a clearly articulated master plan for the educative process which includes student-oriented performance objectives; sequenced sets of experiences organized from task analyses; basic strategies for acquiring the knowledge, skills, and attitudes in these sequences; and evaluation based on the objectives. Thus, we are concerned with creating curricular designs for living, learning, and working which will result in superior urban education.

These designs must successfully combine the life experiences, needs, and environment of the particular inner-city students in relation to the demands and needs of an increasingly technological and value-conflicted society—and one which is only reluctantly facing up to its racism. The traditional content—or textbook—centered curricular designs on which tweaking and tinkering has been done (e.g., broad fields) will no longer suffice. Rather, we must have curricular designs which are centered on the acquisition of realistic problem-solving processes, the steady development of stable and constructive self-images, and the merit of diversity within the mainstream. Such designs must also reach up into the higher education level and encompass all its fields and aspects.

For example, any curricular design would need to be concerned with key communication processes (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing) utilizing students' life experiences and relevant subject-matter contributions which will be applicable to a career ladder for occupations and professions. Moreover, within the communication processes there must be a strong emphasis on reading. Reading is the major gateway not only to school achievement at all levels but also to acquiring the competencies necessary for employment in the skilled and professional occupations and for an enlightened citizenry.

Improved approaches to developing readiness for reading at all educational levels and the teaching of reading itself, must be rapidly identified and implemented. These approaches must also be sharply anchored to the lives of the students involved and the other communication processes (i.e., listening, speaking, and writing)—and, at the same time, they must truly prepare students for the subject-matter demands of the curriculum, e.g., reading an equation. A general performance objective in reading would be: Each student should read at a level commensurate with an accurate estimate of his learning potential.

In addition to curriculum containing the more traditional academic areas, there must also be the inclusion of areas designed to teach the urban child how to deal with such specific urban problems as health—both mental and physical, and including sex education; combating noise and congestion; controlling the environment in order to maintain clean air and water supplies, etc.; understanding and helping to fight the problems of crime, alcoholism, drug addiction, and child abuse. Universities and social agencies must be involved in the development of the curriculum as well as parents, teachers, and students. All have contributions to make to it which are valid and needed.

Supportive Services

Included in this component are all those services—adequately staffed—which make effective learning possible, namely, medical and dental assistance, nutritional services, adequate clothing and shelter provisions, social and psychological assistance, counseling and guidance, occupational and educational placement, drop-out prevention, and recruitment of new personnel. If the students and their families cannot afford such services, then these must be provided. Ill, malnourished, inadequately clothed and sheltered, and/or emotionally upset students—regardless of either their *potential* learning capacities or age levels—do not function as effectively as students who are comparatively free of such problems and stresses. No matter how effective the curriculum is or how dedicated the staff in its implementation, these components can never effect the superior learning program desired if adequate supportive services are not available. Such services are costly but they must receive a high priority in the overall program since they are foundational to it. It is here that cooperative planning with State and local government officials, local social agencies, and Federal programs will become particularly critical in order to maximize the use of existing resources and gain commitments for new ones.

Specifically, these services should encompass the following areas:

1. To provide parents and young adults (e.g., teenagers) with additional information about the various aspects of growth and development of children, e.g., nutrition, the role and significance of language development and ways of enhancing it, constructive ways of dealing with young children's emotions, techniques for problem-solving and the like.

2. To provide parents and young adults with volunteer or special or special paraprofessional training if desired in the various growth and development aspects of children.

3. To insure that services are made available to potential vocational education students and families.

4. To provide at least the minimum daily nutritional requirements of children.

5. To provide adequate health services to children, including examination and follow-up treatments as needed, as well as health education—both mental and physical including sex education.

6. To provide adequate recreational services for children at various age and interest levels.

7. To insure maximum health for infants and expectant mothers.

Community Determination

Although community determination is discussed in detail in Chapter IX, The Authority Structure, it is mentioned here as one of the vital components of a successful urban education program.

Community, in this connection, is broadly defined to include its human and institutional components, all of which can profit and be profited by education locally. In order for that education to be effective, and truly relevant to the child's own frame of reference and environment, all components of the community need to be meaningfully involved in the educational process. Specifically those components are: the inner-city residents themselves; the colleges, junior colleges, universities, vocational and technical training institutions in the area; and local private industries and foundations.

Inner-city residents.—The inner-city residents must be actively involved in all aspects and at each developmental level of the urban educational program. This involvement could take one of several patterns: (1) *control* (i.e., full fiscal, programmatic, and hiring authority); (2) *partnership* (i.e., division of authority with representation from other groups within the urban area); or (3) *participation* (i.e., a combination of advisory and policy-making functions with preferential hiring of community residents). Whatever community involvement pattern is decided upon by the planners, it must have the sanction of the inner-city residents affected as being the most workable pattern for them. Contingent upon the particular pattern chosen would be the degree to which decentralization would come into being. With full community control comes the requirement for full decentralization. With community participation—as defined here, a very limited administrative decentralization might be the only requirement. Whichever pattern is chosen, parents and other inner-city residents should have ready access to the educational staff on a daily basis to enable the staff and the community to solve problems of mutual concern so as to permit continuous feedback, evaluation and rapid modification of the ongoing educational program as well as to train parents as effective educational interventionalists. Programs should be developed which would facilitate teachers visiting the homes of all students. Such components have been highly successful in existing vocational programs and might be utilized wisely at all educational levels, greatly enhancing communication and cooperation between staff and community—and, also, help assure final accountability. Where community and school share responsibility, the patterns of shared accountability must be developed.

Institutions of higher education.—Although colleges have tended to relate to local needs and clientele, other private and public institutions of post secondary and higher education have all too often functioned independent of and segregated from the local community. We have recently witnessed many outbursts directed at the symptoms of such segregation. The times are dictating a radical shift in the colleges' and universities' institutional images, from the medievally-originated concept of the secluded scholarly retreat to that of an active and responsible community member. Many students and some faculty members and administrators, sensitive and receptive to the university's emerging role as community citizen, are already engaged in active participation and partnership with the community. It is necessary that these efforts be expanded so that the expertise of the university is combined with that of the neighborhood communities in preparing children and youth to be members of the society at large. Colleges and universities must alter their all-too-prevalent attitudes that they are functioning responsibly in "maintaining standards" by shutting their doors to those students of disadvantaged backgrounds who do not score comparably to their middle class counterparts for whose culture the measurement tests have been designed. If colleges find that the preparations in skills of the few disadvantaged students currently admitted are obstacles to the full learning potential of these students, they must not merely condemn that preparation. Such colleges owe it not only to those students but also to their own validity as institutions, to involve themselves in the improvement of that preparation during the early years of education. They must realize the importance of expanding their roles and attitudes to include: (1) early involvement with and recruitment of the inner-city student; (2) motivational and skill-oriented pre-college programs; (3) development of curriculum designs appropriate to inner-city students and the education of those who will work with and teach them; (4) re-examination of faculty attitudes toward inner city students whose backgrounds and values are divergent from their own and from a majority of their student peers; and (5) redesigning of teacher training programs and patterns of certification.

Private industries.—Local private industries and foundations, both profit and non-profit, should also be actively engaged in the education of their communities. Such agencies constitute a major resource for needed professional and vocational skills. Moreover, their participation in the educational programs should be mutually beneficial in terms of immediate service to and subsequent employment of community residents.

Experimentation

At all educational developmental levels, the urban education program with its various interlocking components is to be viewed as experimental. Experimentation is therefore to be viewed as an integral part of the general operating program. The dichotomy which has grown between costly research-experimental programs involving small numbers of children and operating programs with large numbers of children (e.g., Title I) must be avoided. Experimentation as conceived here, is for trying out new concepts, techniques, personnel training, staffing patterns, class organizations and the like, *within* the realities of the operating program. This type of experimentation precludes neat independent-dependent variable designs, but, at the same time, permits new approaches to be tried out with immediate feedback results in a realistic way.

Related to this experimental component, are those alternative education programs and approaches which many be piloted or demonstrated as "sub-programs" in the overall master education plan. Such alternatives sponsored within one grantee's master plan are to be distinguished from alternative programs which may be funded and operated outside of or in competition with that particular grantee. Alternatives outside a master plan are discussed in a later section. In this part, we are concerned with alternative programs conducted as experiments within a master plan of a local educational agency. Such experiments can presumably accelerate the rate of effecting institutional change within a system and may take one of the following forms:

Community Schools.—Community schools offer servics and leadership in response to joint planning by the school and the community to improve communication and to better meet the community's needs. To truly serve its community, the school should be placed where all members of the community, old and young would have the opportunity to learn. It may also function as a community center where health and legal services, counseling and employment are offered. A successful example of this type of school is the Mott Program in Dearborn, Michigan.

Model subsystems.—Model subsystems such as those now operating in the District of Columbia, New York and Boston are used as testing-and-demonstration-grounds for new programs. Governed by a community board they have the freedom to experiment widely in curriculum and other recruitment and utilization of teachers and the management of the system itself. Basic to the subsystem approach is the premise that model schools have a close and direct tie to the rest of the school system in order to influence that system's practices.

Street academies.—Street academies may operate either as an experiment or a demonstration within a master plan, or as an alternative to a master plan. An example of this genre is the system of Street Academies sponsored by the Urban League in Harlem which caters to students who have dropped out of the public schools. The Academies, usually abandoned storefronts, are manned by teachers and streetworkers, often alumni of an Academy who live in the area where they work and are therefore more able to communicate with prospective students. The educational process is three-tiered. First, a student attends the Street Academy, then the Academy of Transition. After he has achieved 8th or 9th grade levels of performance, he goes to one of the college preparatory schools, either Newark or Harlem Prep (so far 90 percent of Academy students have gone on.) The success of the academies is due primarily to the fact that they are truly decentralized units. They work from the street up and adapt the institution to fit the relationship between streetworkers and teachers and students. Recently the entire Academy program has been moving towards greater involvement with the public schools. For example Benjamin Franklin High School in Harlem farms out truants and dropouts to the Street Academies.

Experimental classrooms.—Such examples would include the Duhl School which proposes a new K–4 school for lower-class communities. It assumes that what are needed are four years of preliminary work to get the underprivileged child ready to meet the demands of school. In each urban neighborhood, a classroom would be built in the community, in the living environment of the child utilizing especially built rooms in new housing or space modified for classroom use in older housing. A collection of these rooms joined by electronic devices would comprise a school. The parents and community would be part of the classroom—the "urban agents" which tie the child to the community.

Assessment

As with experimentation, assessment is to be considered as an integral part of the general operating educational program. Assessment is defined here as the extent to which the students in the educational program are manifesting those behaviors stated in its objectives at various educational levels. Implicit in this definition is the requirement that the educational objectives are synonymous with the assessment objectives and that they are measurable in the form of overt behaviors of some sort. Moreover, an assessment design for the type of master plan proposed would encompass far more than the mere use of

standardized academic achievement measures. Rather, it would involve a multi-faceted approach to the educative process (e.g. the physical, social, emotional, and academic performances of students at various levels.) Results obtained from the assessment component should be fed into the planning and other components so that necessary modifications and adjustments can be made as rapidly as possible. These results should also yield information—albeit indirectly—on the effectiveness of institutional change as reflected in teaching style(s) in the classroom, in middle- and upper-level administration, utilization of resources, and ultimately the impact of the program. The main focus of these designs must be upon the behaviors of students—and not upon such issues as management efficiency and cost effectiveness. When these kinds of issues become the focus, the learning of students becomes either subordinated or completely lost. Finally, the assessment should have a national thrust so that information on target groups can be secured, analyzed, summarized, and disseminated in comparable ways.

Facilities

The need for additional school facilities is critical in most urban areas. Urban school populations continue to mushroom while available space and monies for construction grow increasingly scarce. The master need for and possible use of new school facilities and an account of the ways in which the community intends to obtain maximum use of existing facilities. Specifically, plans should include the below-noted considerations.

The creation of new ways to use space and facilities more effectively and creatively.—This might include extensive use of the natural and physical resources of the city including museums, art galleries, aquariums, parks, newspaper and government offices and so on as an integral part of the educational program. Classes may also be located in libraries, department stores, college labs, abandoned storefronts. If a different or unusual kind of environment improves student performance it should be utilized.

A premium should be placed on the construction of new educational facilities within all low and middle income housing constructed with the assistance of public funds.

Likewise, educational facilities should be included in public assisted commercial constructon, shopping centers, etc. and other office space. Such facilities may provide a significant avenue for racially integrated early school programs. These last two suggestions could also provide a major financial saving if planned at the time original architectural designs are drawn up.

Integration of facilities with the local educational program.—For example, if early childhood education is to be a goal, the possibility of constructing facilities in schools for demonstration centers should be considered. Such centers could act as models for teacher training, and materials research and development. Day care/educational centers could also be established in vocational and high schools for the benefit of children, students, and teachers. Additional progarms could be developed to provide high school students and other members of the community with special training in child care, family planning, home economcs, etc. Hospitals and other health facilities built with public funds, are also a prime target place. Early childhood programs should be open to all hospital personnel including health manpower trainees who are among the most marginally employed of all institutional empolyees at the present time.

Multipurpose use.—Where possible, facilities should be designed for recreational, vocational, research and demonstration, and administrative uses. Facilities should be geared to meeting the needs of the entire community; infants; youth out of school; adults; the elderly; as well as those of the children in school.

Impact.—Facilities and programs should be analyzed in terms of cost, design, site location, future use, etc., to determine potentially favorable impacts upon the local economy and community use.

In summary, the large majority of the Task Force feels that major institutional changes are needed in urban education, and that the Federal government should play an active role in recommending the components and processes of programs which will bring about desired change. A minority view held by a few members was that the Federal Government should not be involved with the setting of criteria and the recommending of program components. Instead, these members suggested that the only proper functions of the Federal level were funding and subsequently, the auditing and monitoring of these funds.

The Need for Alternatives to the Master Plan

The large majority of the Task Force recommends that the existing educational institutions and/or new combinations of existing institutions constitute the best initial mechanisms for developing the master urban education plan. It is to be stressed again that only the educational system is large enough to make the major changes for the improvement of the education of urban students. However, this majority recommends the funding of alternative programs outside of or in competition with the master plan to meet specific needs and problems not taken into account by the more comprehensive master plan. Such alternatives might fall into the following categories.

Educational parks.—Such parks offer more than just a parallel public school system. They could, hopefully, in the not-too-distant future supplant the entire concept of the traditional public school system because they would be of sufficient size and comprehensive enough in nature. Parks are in various stages of planning in Syracuse, East Orange, Boston, Rochester, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. The parks represent a totally planned system, an all-encompassing social community plaza with education and participation of the total community as its focal point. Not only education but related services, such as public health and counseling services would be offered with a constant interplay between service institutions and the educational area. Its participants would be racially economically and ethnically integrated. The major problem seems to be the one of finances. The park concept would involve a large commitment from the total resources of the region to be served in addition to a substantial commitment of State and Federal resources.

Publicly-funded private schools for children of the inner city.—The Highland Park Free School, is by far the most ambitious and most comprehensive project of this type. These schools, free from the bureaucratic inertia and rigid architectural structures of the public schools, can provide a setting responsive to the kind of experiment and innovation needed in urban education, and provides some healthy competition for the public schools. Also, they can demonstrate their program with high visibility.

City-as-classroom structures.—This school-without-walls in Philadelphia, the Parkway Project, is one of the more unusual experiments in education. There is no single school building as such. Non-graded classes take place in two dozen different places such as the zoo, art museum, YMCA. The lack of physical and instructional structure give the students the opportunity to study independently or in small groups and to design their own curricula. Students, black and white, are chosen at random from 2000 applications from public and parochial schools.

Regional State schools.—These schools would be financed by the States and would cut across urban-suburban lines.

Federal regional schools.—Such schools would be financed by the Federal Government out of present State aid funds or with additional Federal funds. These schools would be able to cut through State boundaries and could make provisions for residential students.

College- and university-related open schools.—These schools, financed by colleges and universities would be part of their laboratories in education. They would be open to the public and not restricted to professors' children. Parents, students, and community leaders ought to be given significant representation in the policy-making process so that the university does not play an exclusive role.

Industrial demonstration schools.—These schools, financed by industrial business and commercial firms in the same way churches support parochial schools, would serve their employees and selected members of the public. They wouold *not* be vocational schools but standard elementary and high schools.

Labor union sponsored schools.—These schools would be largely but not exclusively for children of union members.

Army schools.—The Defense Department has been effectively educating the casualties of our present public schools. It is hereby suggested that they greatly expand their program. Schools for dropouts and educational rejects could be set up adjacent to camps, but not necessarily as an integral part of the military.

Learning center projects and advancement schools.—The Philadelphia School Board project consists of discovery oriented classrooms, located in nine schools which comprise a network of innovative classroom structures. In the fall of 1968, a group of teachers opened a separate laboratory school for further experimentation. The Pennsylvania Advancement School (formerly the North Carolina Advancement School) is a semi-autonomous corporation with its own board. It has complete freedom to try new ideas and methods. It draws from the city's public and parochial schools and offers staff development programs for teachers during the summer.

Voucher system.—The voucher system is one of the more controversial alternatives which has been proopsed to the present system of public education. A voucher, valued at the national average of public expenditures per pupil would be given to students whose family income lies below the middle income level so that he could choose the school, public or private, he wished to attend. The value of this system is that it would introduce the element of competition which could provide the external stimulus to reform within the public schools. Competition makes for a strong incentive to incorporate new programs in order to provide what their customers, the students and their parents, want.

The Task Force, as a whole, favored considering the voucher system as *one* of the alternatives as a means of both accelerating institutional change and providing an appropriate education for urban students. However, it was the sense of the Task Force generally that it did not favor the voucher system as the only educational alternative to the master plan since there are a number of other alternatives which are worthy of being tried out as well. Some of these other alternatives have been briefly described in this section.

Chapter IX. An Urban Education Act—the Authority Structure

The Task Force recommends that the Office of Education, in its development of an Urban Education Act, give careful consideration to the question of the need for restructuring of authority on all levels, Federal, State, municipal and community—both

for the grantor and grantee of funds. The Task Force therefore presents its rationale for new roles at each level and defines the general dimensions of each of these roles.

Accordingly, this chapter is presented in four major sections: 1) A Rationale for an Expanded Community Role; 2) Relationships among Communities in Urban Areas; 3) The Role of the State; and 4) The Need for Federal Reorganization and the Establishment of an OE Bureau of Urban Education.

A Rationale for an Expanded Community Role

The Task Force supports the principle that no significant or effective changes in urban education can be achieved without the involvement and support of those parents and local community residents who have heretofore been excluded from the process of decision-making concerning the goals and priorities of the schools. To this end, we recommend that an Urban Education Act:

1. Require a mechanism for community determination that provides for substantive community impact on policy development and implementation. Such a mechanism should be designed at the local level.
2. Make provisions for the training of school administrators and school board members in accommodating themselves to the above mechanism.
3. Provide funds to a planning group for staff which must create the mechanism for community determination.
4. Provide for evaluation by the Federal government to obtain information to analyze the process of change in the educational system in order to insure that there is substantive decision-making by the community.
5. Provide for evaluation at the local level to insure that the mechanism achieves its objective in making the system more accountable to its clients.

The Problems With Present Local Agents of Authority

In Chapter IV of this report, several aspects of the problem with the urban school system were documented. In that chapter, we stated that the authority figures, the policy-makers and administrators, are often "either too remote from or too indifferent to all of the constituencies they are supposed to serve." In this section, the failure of these current local agents of authority is discussed as one aspect of the rationale for increased community determination. The three agents which currently have a role in the governance of urban school systems are: (1) school boards; (2) school administrators; and (3) teacher organizations. None of these groups have succeeded in bringing about the necessary changes in the school system—although by vestiture of authority, all have had the potential. The reasons for these failures are myriad.

School boards.—School boards in our urban centers are not representative of the people they serve. Members are generally of upper and middle class cultures with attitudes that reflect such cultures. In many cities where a large majority of the school children are Negro or Spanish-speaking, the boards are composed of nearly all whites or Anglos. Where school boards do have minority group members, the latter are generally middle class men and women who have escaped from the slums and often have as little in common with the ghetto dweller as the rest of the board. As a result, the boards are infrequently responsive to the needs of the ghetto schools.

Not only are the boards unrepresentative of the people in terms of socioeconomic factors, buy they are also unrepresentative in terms of the size of the population being represented. Table 1 illustrates the point by indicating the comparative populations and school board sizes in four urban areas and nearby suburbs.

School Administrators.—Much of what has been previously stated about the dissimilarities between the members of school boards and their constituents holds true for school administrators and those same parents, community residents and students. Few school administrators are truly representative of the community being served.

Further, these same administrators are separated from that community even more by the insularity imposed on them by the nature of their function within a large bureaucracy.

Generally, involved with problems of budget and administrative detail, even those administrators—few in numbers—who are program-trained and -oriented, have little direct contact with those they serve. As an all too frequent result, the administrator comes to hold the attitude that his service to his school board holds a prior commitment to that of service to the child. Also the administrator's inevitable bureaucracy creates a hierarchy, somewhere at the bottom of which is the child. Too often the bureacracy serves its needs—not the child's.

The factors of the size and complexity of many school bureaucracies limits the facilitation of change. There are always rules to be quoted to prevent action—and often little incentive to create it.

Insulated from their students, senior administrators are at the same time insulated from the very human resources who might make them more effective in their roles. Few administrators take advantage of the trained personnel of their own staff or those of local colleges and universities, or of businesses and private industries nearby. As potential liaisons to many varied community echelons for mutually beneficial services, school administrators have generally overlooked this vital function.

The very autonomy of the local school systems serves to insulate administrators yet a step further. Systems free of the forces of change from without perpetuate unresponsiveness within.

A hopeful sign in the generally bleak scene of top city school administration is the emergence of a "new breed" of superintendent—one who perceives of his role, and functions in it, as an agent of change in the relations between the school and the community, e.g. the establishment of community schools in Philadelphia and other places.

TABLE 1.—RELATION OF SIZE OF SCHOOL BOARD TO POPULATION IN EIGHT SELECTED CITIES

	Population (1960)	Current size of school board
City:		
Los Angeles	2,479,015	7
Santa Monica	83,249	7
Baltimore	939,024	9
Hagerstown, Md	36,660	6
Detroit	1,670,144	7
Ann Arbor	67,340	9
New York City	7,781,984	9
Mount Vernon, N.Y.	76,010	9

Source: (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., U.S. Bureau of Census, 1969, pp. 21–22; County and City Data Book, U.S. Bureau of Census, 1967, pp. 464–573). Survey of public education in the member cities of the council of big city boards of education, National Schools Boards Association, Washington, D.C., 1968 pp. 9–14.

Failure of the Teachers' Organizations

Neither the large teachers unions nor groups of non-union teachers have been effective in catalyzing the kinds of institutional changes needed to provide a successful education for inner-city students.

The teachers individually.—Although as we saw in Chapter IV, teachers in isolated instances have been highly critical of the role they have been assigned and of the system which perpetuates such roles, many teachers are generally resistant to change. They are, after all, a part of the system which employs them and over a period of time develop loyalties which may tend to cloud objectivity.

Concurrently, over the years, teachers in a sense "invest themselves" in a classroom, developing their own personal concept of themselves as teachers. Such a concept involves acquiring attitudes toward the students and formulating their personal teaching methods, techniques, and materials. Understandably, they react defensively when this concept is challenged as irrelevant, inappropriate, and/or discriminatory. Whether the challenge is valid or not for a particular teacher, it reflects a change on the part of the students. What was once accepted is no longer. Teachers individually are facing a re-examination of their attitudes, roles and methods. The need for flexibility and continuous self-assessment is one of their greatest challenges, if they as individuals are to be responsive to current needs and problems.

The teacher unions and organizations.—Instead of serving as a strong advocate for changes in urban education programs or in the role of the teacher in urban schools, teacher organizations generally have been reluctant to depart from their traditional concerns over the status of the teacher.

These organizations have been and still are important crusaders for teachers' rights and privileges, and have led a crucial battle to raise the status of the teachers in their own perceptions as well as in the perceptions of their administrations and community. Unions have led the fight for contracts which reflect the impact of such criteria as length of time in service, level of education, working conditions, and grievance procedures. Such unions performed a vital function historically and continue to provide teachers with valuable protection.

However, the times are demanding more of the teachers and accordingly more of their unions and organizations. If contracts should in fact reflect the criterion of effective performance of teachers in the classroom with their students, then the unions have not as yet prepared themselves to negotiate on such terms.

With the unions' past and present primary thrust on salary, tenure and related administrative concerns, little attempt has been made to examine the teacher in terms of his effectiveness with his students. The unions would need to alter those thrusts in order to deal with this need and to accomplish significant change in current urban education.

Legitimacy of the Community's Role in Education

The educator, Goodwin Watson, provides a succinct analysis of why change cannot be brought about by those who currently operate the urban education system:

"[The school system] is managed by a school board drawn largely from upper-class circles; it is taught by teachers who came largely from middle-class backgrounds; and it is attended by children from working-class homes. These three groups do not talk the same language. They differ in their manners, power and values." (Keach, Fulton and Gardner, 1967, pp. 6–7).

Watson points out that no meaningful change can occur without the support of the inner-city parents and community. It is this group which can provide the greatest stake in bringing about change; it is this group which neither has a voice nor has it been mobilized in support of the schools.

Why the community should have an active role.—The education system owes accountability to the parents of the children whom it purports to be educating, and rightly so. For it is the parents who have a deeply *personal* concern in what the long-term outcomes will be for their children when their

children are not learning to read or are unable to find jobs. Giving parents and local community residents legitimate responsibility and thus decision-making power for effectively modifying the urban schools would allow them to make their contributions in the form of a more highly constructive and sensitive input than is currently possible. The inner-city community has potential power, energy, and enthusiasm for effecting positive and needed changes which have never really been tapped.

It is traditional in American society for the people to have the major voice in the decisions that govern our society and to demand that its institutions be responsive to and representative of the will of the people. If school boards as presently constituted in our urban areas do not achieve such responsiveness and representativeness, they should not—and they cannot—stand as viable and legitimate democratic institutions.

What the community can contribute.—Only members of the alienated and disaffected minority groups can accurately represent the deep-seated frustration, anger, and hostility directed toward the school system. That input simply cannot emanate from the white middle-class school board member, administrator, or teacher, or even from a black in one of those roles. Without an understanding of the causes and extent of this disaffection, changes in urban school systems will fall short of what is needed.

The parents and community can provide a reality base for the educators. It is the parents who can best articulate the goals and values of the inner-city population. It is they who can suggest techniques or approaches to make the program of the schools personally valid and economically useful to the student from the ghetto.

Parents can provide the system with a new link to the child. Academic and social outcomes of the schools are often related to the degree to which parents understand and reenforee the goals of the schools. The parents can provide an atmosphere in the home which either thwarts or fosters learning. Such parental positivism is in direct proportion to the opportunity those parents have to participate in the schools.

Models for Community Reponsibility for Change

It is not the role of the Federal government to prescribe the kinds of or degree of changes which ought to take place at the local level. It is possible, however, to describe some of the efforts of urban systems which have linked decision-making authority to the community.

Most of these efforts for effecting change manifest two major features in some form. One is decentralization; the other, community involvement in the schools. While there are many variations in and degrees of decentralization and community involvement in the schools in such efforts, some general patterns for both can be identified.

Decentralization.—The term, in education, generally refers to a delegation of certain kinds of authority and responsibility by a duly constituted legal school board to a subdivision or unit within its purview. As we have analyzed the situation, there seem to be four basic variations of decentralization currently in existence, which can be distinguished from one another in terms of the degree of authority and responsibility which are delegated. They are, as follows:

1. Decentralization which assigns certain types of administrative matters (e.g., placement of teachers, use of specially trained personnel, processing of requests for materials and equipments) to a geographical subdivision of the school district. In this variation, all of the major policy- and decision-making power resides in the central board and administration.

2. Decentralization in which the geographical subdivisions have area or district superintendents who handle all of the above types of matters and also have major authority and responsibility for programmatic and personnel affairs. In this variation, the area superintendent usually has very considerable decision-making power and can deploy the personnel or alter the program as he deems necessary under the authority of the school board and the superintendent. In both of these variations, the shifting of authority is within the educational system.

3. Decentralization which permits a *de facto* community involvement in the decisionmaking process in the form of an advisory board or a planning council for a school or subsystem. Such an arrangement is usually a somewhat informal one in that there is no formal legal contract and the delegation of authority and responsibility are informally worked out between the educational system and the community groups in terms of the scope. Such an arrangement may vary in its scope from decision-making on program, priority-setting for expenditure of monies, and hiring practices to merely a glorified complaint department. In this form, the final authority and responsibility are still retained by the central school board and administration—although, in point of fact, the local council or "board" may have considerable policy-making authority.

4. Decentralization which involves full delegation of authority and responsibility, including the financial area, to a duly constituted legal entity, such as a non-profit corporation or another school board within the geographical limits of a school district. In this variation, the State authority and/or local central board and the other legal entity enter into a contract in which the authority and responsibility are specifically designated for a particular period of time or until otherwise rescinded by a still higher authority, e.g., State educational agency or the State legislature.

Community involvement in the schools.—Although difficult to characterize in a general way, the phrase, community involvement in the schools, generally means a higher degree of participation by neighborhood residents in the operations of a school or a subsystem than is typically accorded to neighborhood parents and leaders. As was previously noted in Chapter VIII, we have identified three basic patterns within the many variations which currently exist: *participation* in the system; *partnership* with the system; and *control* over some school or subsystem within the system. In this chapter, we consider each one of them in relation to the degree and extent of decision-making authority it would be likely to have in effecting changes in the urban education system. The analyses of the three patterns of involvement in terms of authority are below-noted.

1. As participation is conceived nere, with its possible combination of advisory and policy-making functions, there is no guarantee that community parents and residents would really have an effective role in the governance of or programs in their local schools. Where a particular school or an area administrator was genuinely concerned with the contribution which the community could make in terms of needed changes or modifications in curriculum, supportive services, and staff, this pattern might be effective. We say might be effective advisedly because there would be no assurance that the central administration or the school board would be willing to go along with the changes which the local community and a particular school administrator wished to make. The history of local advisory boards with ESEA, Title I and parent advisory committees with Head Start and Follow Through has been quite uneven. Policy level decision-making is not often realized; and the advisory capacity can often be ignored. The opportunities for major institutional change being effected through this pattern on a scale required by the magnitude of the urban education problem seem very unlikely.

2. With partnership, described here as a division of authority, there is a sharing of the decision-making power—either in an informal arrangement (e.g., a set of understandings worked out with the local school board and administration) or a formal agreement, e.g., a legal contract stipulating the precise division of authority and responsibility. The opportunities for major institutional change occurring through this pattern on either an informal or a formal basis are very considerable. An advantage of this pattern is that the technical assistance which a large school system has can be deployed to facilitate the "partnership" school or subsystem unit in planning and making necessary changes since support for these changes has already been secured. Moreover, the continuing financial and material resources of the larger unit are still available to the partnership unit in addition to securing resources from other agencies. However, the division of *de facto* authority is very critical here. That is, how are the partners in actuality? If the community's role is very junior, then this pattern cannot be effective. If its role is at least equal or perhaps, senior in the key decision-making areas, this pattern has real potential for effecting institutional change at a reasonably rapid pace.

3. With control, conceived here as full authority in fiscal, programmatic, and hiring matters the community board or authority legally replaces the central school board. Within the limits of State laws and municipal regulations including any other agencies with which it must deal (e.g. the teachers' union) the community can operate its school or subsystem making such changes as it deems necessary and can afford. Four factors are critical here: (a) assuring and maintaining adequate monies to operate the eductional unit; (b) training of community members in the operation of the unit; (c) securing the appropriate personnel for the key positions; and (d) utilizing appropriate technical assistance. The opportunity for creating institutional changes rapidly is undoubtedly the greatest with this pattern. However the effectiveness of this institutional change will be contingent on how well the community in this situation can deal with the above-noted factors.

The large majority of the Task Force recommends that decentralization and community involvement must be considered as major avenues to institutional change. And we further recommend that the third and fourth patterns described for decentralization and the second and third patterns described for community involvement are the ones *most* likely to effect the institutional changes so badly needed in urban education from the standpoint of authority. A minority viewpoint within the Task Force maintains that local needs and conditions are too diverse to permit making recommendations in the areas of decentralization and community control.

Relationships Among Communities in Urban Areas

While the main thrust of an Urban Education Act will be directed at the inner-city with authority for such programs vested in school districts and local communities the Task Force majority recommends an alternative thrust which will involve the larger metropolitan population as participants in an urban education program.

For reasons that are stated in following paragraphs of this chapter, the Task Force recommends that comprehensive metropolitan planning be encouraged where it will result in:

1. A realignment of present school systems.

2. Mutual benefit among all education agencies and related resource agencies.

3. An effort to capitalize on the strengths of the entire metropolitan area in order to meet its needs.

4. A trend toward decentralization of many educational matters of program and administration to individual schools.

Rationale for Alternative Metropolitan Thrust

The above recommendations were developed for the following reasons.

The existence of non-localized educational problems.—The problems which confront urban educational institutions are not contained within particular political, geographical boundaries. Cities as well as their suburbs face educational problems, the roots of which spread across city lines.

The existence of non-localized problems related to education.—The problems which confront urban educational institutions are by no means exclusively educational by nature. They may be related to corollary problems of housing, employment, racial isolation, nutrition, health, all of which hold implications for city and suburb alike.

The presence of disadvantaged populations outside the central city.—That minority portion of the suburban population with poverty level incomes and greatest education needs should not be overlooked.

Availability of financial and human resources.—Those problems common to city and suburban systems could draw solutions from a wider pool of financial and human resources.

Advantages for students through enriched programs.—Continuing planning and development of programs and special projects could take place which would involve city and suburban students, staffs, communities of all racial, cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. Such programs might serve to:

1. Expand the students' concept of himself and his role in the larger community.

2. Allow both students and staff to become aware of different and similar aspects of cultures and values beyond one's immediate background and/or neighborhood.

3. Allow suburban students to benefit from the physical, cultural, educational, human resources of the inner-city and vice-versa.

4. Encourage and build in mechanisms for racial and ethnic interdependence and integration.

5. Allow a cross-fertilization of experimental program findings which could be replicated.

6. Generally make available the resources of the larger community to a small community or to a particular school or student whose needs may not be met within the immediate area.

The need for comprehensive planning in education.—There is need for comprehensive planning in education. Not until relatively recent years have metropolitan agencies joined together to consider mutual areas of interest such as transportation and land use. Education has rarely been on such agendas.

Existence of scattered successful examples of metropolitan planning.—There are indications that planning on a metropolitan scale is a growing, albeit a currently scattered, concern. No significant models of total metropolitan planning have been developed to date, yet on limited bases, several projects are making inroads to comprehensive planning and cooperation between districts within cities and between city and suburban areas.

For example, the Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Areas, Inc.—an organization of superintendents and university professors—has produced basic research on school organization, school output measures, and surveys on financing and taxation programs for its 35 member districts (Havighurst, 1967, pp. 393–409).

Dade County, Florida, is an 'example of a larger area which has assumed responsibility for transportation, schools, fires and police protection, housing and urban renewal, and zoning. Under this arrangement, functions which are not specifically designated to the County remain with the local municipalities.

The Nashville-Davidson County consolidation is another good example of the union of several local governments into a single metropolitan form of government and the simultaneous union of school districts into a single metropolitan school authority which has the responsibility of taxing the entire area and distributing tax money equitably. The new school authority has other responsibilities including the choice of sites for new school buildings. The separate school districts retain their authority for the administration of their local school systems.

The compatibility of metropolitanism and decentralization.—It is possible to centralize some functions while decentralizing others. Any plan for the broadening of school boundaries should be accompanied by a plan to decentralize many purely local educational decisions and to involve the community which is directly served.

Theodore Sizer in *Schools in the City,* writes:

"Thus we need to move in two different directions at once: to centralize some functions and to decentralize others. The former alone will lead to a deadening bureaucracy, as many of our present large systems already demonstrate. The latter alone will lead to missed opportunities and parochialism.

"Metropolitan allocation of children is a necessity if we are to have in communities any sort of racial or socio-economic balance: this is obvious. But there are other virtues, ones of possibly even greater long-term importance. New kinds of programs for children and adults may be possible. Certain economies may result from the elimination of small, duplicated offices. The wide area could easily support strong schools for special purposes. . . . The region might also be able to support, perhaps in conjunction with the state, systems of collegiate and technical education which could be functionally related to lower schools. Of great importance is the possibility of far more diverse sources of local tax revenues, sufficient, perhaps, in many areas to maintain an independence of overwhelming state and federal aid." (Sizer, 1967, pp. 293–294.)

The Task Force is cognizant of the several real and imagined reservations toward a metropolitan thrust. Some of the real obstacles that would need to be overcome if a metropolitan thrust were to be made are:

1. A potential perpetuation of the present imbalance of financial resources favoring the suburbs.

2. Lack of conviction of the part of suburbs that they can benefit from partnership with the cities.

3. Establishment on a clear authority with effective mechanisms for interagency coordination.

4. Insuring such vital resources as interest, models, time, money, staff, etc.

5. Rejection by inner city residents of individuals who live elsewhere participating in decisions concerning it.

Some of the stated reservations are the fears that metropolitanism: spells the end to local control and to schools which are responsive to people; encourages bureaucracies more vast and impersonal ones than the present ones; leads to Federal control over education. Such fears are misplaced in the judgment of the Task Force majority. A minority viewpoint held that the reservations are sufficient to outweigh the potential advantages of metropolitanisms.

The Task Force majority holds that each city must weigh the obstacles of metropolitan against the advantages as they relate to local strengths and problems, but urges that such a thrust be at least considered as an alternative.

The Role of the States

The Task Force recommends that an Urban Education Act should clearly define the role of the States, considering both their present practices which often do not favor urban education and their significance for future urban education. The Task Force also recommends that the requirements for recognition and correction of inequities in State aid formulas which discriminate against urban areas must be defined. Moreover, the Task Force recommends that the Act provide incentive grants to States which require State matching and State maintenance of effort for the new and improved education programs for the urban impoverished groups.

Present State Biases Against Urban Education

For a number of reasons, among them, inadequate staff, and a definite suburban or rural bias, States have failed to adequately respond to the complex problems of urban education. Allocation formulas of both State and Federal funds to school districts remain outmoded and continue to favor suburban and rural systems. State legislatures have done little, if anything, to deal with the racial imbalance in schools. Outmoded teacher certification requirments continue to plague the understaffed urban schools.

Need for Incentives Which Will Expand the States' Role With Regard to the Urban Disadvantaged

At least part of the problem in past efforts to aid the disadvantaged has been the poorly defined roles and expectations of Federal, State, and local education agencies. A new concept of shared responsibility for urban education, involving a Federal-State-local partnership is imperative. Above all, there is a need for new forms of communication, joint review of proposals and revenue sharing.

State legislatures and departments of education have a critical role to play in the urban education crisis. Because of their constitutional responsibility for education via their taxing and distribution powers, they have a tremendous influence on the direction urban education will take. With this in mind, the Task Force urges that an Urban Education Act provide, on a matching basis, incentive grants to the States. Where needed, such grants should provide for a reform of State school finance programs and encourage State governments to build State aid plans which: (1) recognize the differences in relative needs and costs between urban, rural and suburban localities in given areas of school services; (2) not only measure difference in local property values per pupil, but also take into account the total fiscal effort of the locality; and (3) consider measurements reflecting differences in pupil characteristics which correlate closely with low achievement. Use of these two sets of factors by States would almost surely increase the State aid flowing to urban districts and would tend to decrease the possibility that States might balance any Federal increase in urban aid by increases in State aid to suburbs.

In addition, the Task Force recommends that incentive funds be used to promote the following types of activities:

1. The establishment of urban education units in State departments of education which would provide the following services: technical assistance for facilitating restructuring of urban districts within the State and the drafting of necessary legislation; evaluation of urban education programs,

trends, benchmarks, etc., assistance in the area of development and use of new testing measures for the disadvantaged and the use of new indicators of achievement such as parental involvement, attendance, rate of vandalism, and so on.

2. The examination and revision of requirements for certification to permit new sources of personnel both for leadership and teaching purposes.

3. The examination and setting of standards for physical facilities (e.g., special needs for early childhood centers).

4. The creation of State and local units which can fulfill the role of providing information about, and advocacy of urban educational needs.

5. The creation of planning and approval mechanisms for urban education program proposals within the State.

The Need for Federal Reorganization and the Establishment of an OE Bureau of Urban Education

The Task Force majority recommends the following steps be taken in the realm of OE organization:

(1) As an interim measure, prior to the passage of an Urban Education Act, the consolidation within OE of those special programs which serve the needs of disadvantaged children under an Associate Commissioner for Programs Serving the Disadvantaged. An appropriate bureau or office title may be designed in keeping with the current OE reorganization.

(2) As the development of new program authorization permits, the creation of a new Bureau for Urban Education with a clear mandate to operate programs and establish Office-wide priorities for effectively and rapidly meeting urban educational needs in all OE programs.

Structure and special characteristics.—The Commissioner should afford the establishment and structure of such an office priority commensurate with the vital functions it will perform. Accordingly, he should demonstrate the priority he assigns to urban education by locating such a unit within his immediate office. As an interim move, this office should be given immediate operating responsibility for programs which have a focus on the disadvantaged such as Title I ESEA, Follow Through, Bilingual and Dropout Prevention programs and the demonstration project in Anacostia (D.C.). The unit should be directed by an Associate Commissioner and be afforded its own program, salaries and expense budget. Its staff should be recruited from both Federal and non-Federal sources. Those with Federal experience should possess special skills and expertise in urban education and problems, in congressional liaison and in coordinating Federal programs within and between agencies and departments. Other staff should be drawn from among urban planners, community organizers, staff from mayors' and governors' offices, human resources administrators, members of health and welfare councils, as well as teachers and administrators with experience in city school systems.

Rationale for the structure and special characteristics.—The Task Force recommends the establishment of an office with the dimensions, directorship and staffing described above because of the weight and importance of its functions and because attempts to fulfill those functions through a smaller unit have been unsatisfactory in the past.

Late in 1968, the position of a Special Assistant to the Commissioner of Education for Urban Education was created. In so doing, the Commissioner did acknowledge the special nature of urban school problems by placing the Special Assistant in a significant position in the bureaucracy. The creation of this position was an attempt to focus OE attention on urban problems through an effort to affect program guidelines and sharpen their impact on urban areas. However, the impact of the position of Special Assistant has thus far been limited, primarily because the position lacks real power in dealing with the line Bureaus and Divisions within the Office. The Task Force concludes that the functions of the Special Assistant be incorporated into the expanded Office of Urban Education structure.

The history of the special staff unit created in 1965 to serve the disadvantaged (Office of Programs for the Disadvantaged) is likewise one of ineffectual policy implementation. Creation of this unit has served merely to accentuate the requirement for more forceful recognition of the program needs of disadvantaged populations. In the U.S. Office of Education, the point has been clearly established that staff units have no powers to match those units who operate programs, and typically they cease to function at all.

Finally, the Commissioner and the Secretary must recognize that a new operating environment for programs serving disadvantaged populations must be created if the Federal Office is to achieve the purpose of advocacy for educational change in favor of these groups. The existing bureau environment for such programs as title I of ESEA strongly suggests that operating priority to special programs for the poor will not be realized within a structure that is committed to the educational *status quo.*

Functions.—The new office should at a minimum perform the following functions:

1. Provide the Commissioner the arm to implement the short-term recommendations in Chapter XII of this report.

2. Coordinate the efforts of the U.S. Office of Education in preparing and supplying back-up materials for the passage of an Urban Education Act in Congress.

3. Coordinate existing OE programs to focus adequate attention on urban areas. To accomplish this, the Office should initiate action and have final authority in:

The review of existing program guidelines to assess their impact on urban areas to make necessary changes to sharpen the focus on urban programs.

The development of clear program objectives for OE programs in urban areas.

The development of review and evaluation procedures to measure the success of OE programs in urban areas against the stated objectives.

The supervision and training of the staff of those arms of the Office of Education which will perform the review and evaluations (NCES, OPPE).

The review of all research projects sponsored by OE and by OE funded programs to more sharply focus their attention on urban education problems.

4. Administer those operating programs now authorized by the ESEA (titles I, VII and section 807) which have special mandates for serving disadvantaged populations in urban and rural areas.

5. Administer demonstration programs to foster experimentation in urban schools.

Such projects might include the Anacostia School Project, the Fort Lincoln New Town Project, and a model school sponsored and administered by the USOE in Washington.

Funds for such demonstration projects could come from existing pieces of legislation (e.g., title IV, ESEA, the additional $180 million appropriated under title I, ESEA, or the Vocational Education Amendments).

6. Direct the development and operation of an information center to:

Collect from LEAs and SEAs and other appropriate sources and disseminate basic data on urban school systems.

Collect and disseminate information on research and implementation of successful urban program designs nad urban educational policies from public and private sources.

Collect data and maintain records on all OE programs on a city-to-city basis which indicate specific program allocations as well as aggregate Federal funding levels in order to better determine OE's policy on and priority for the problems of urban education.

7. Provide professional and expert assistance form the Office of Urban Education and from public and private agencies to local educational agencies from consultation services.

8. Coordinate with other Federal agencies in the development of their program in urban areas, e.g., Model Cities.

9. Act as an advocate/ombudsman for citizens groups concerned with the operation of Federal programs in cities, e.g., title I local advisory committees.

10. Sponsor retraining programs for Federal personnel to keep them abreast of issues and developments in urban education.

11. Assist the Commissioner in articulating his concerns, policies and plans for mobilizing Federal resources to meet the problem of urban schools, to the OE, HEW staffs, as well as to the public and to Congress.

Rationale for the functions.—Beyond the rationale provided throughout the report for its long- and short-term recommendations, we would like to emphasize at this point the tremendous need to learn more about and coordinate Federal programs—their levels of funding and patterns of money distribution—which affect education in urban areas.

During the course of preparing this report, we have reached three stark conclusions that more than provide a rationale for the above functions to be performed by an Office of Urban Education. These conclusions are:

1. *The plight of urban education is largely undocumented.* The country is in the midst of a revolution in education. City school systems are under attack by the consumers of education who are poor and black and who see education as the means by which they may enter the mainstream of American life. Their expectations have been raised by national movements which promised much but delivered little. Integration, educational reform movements have failed. Educators are seeking means to deal with problems in cities' schools.

The Federal Government is not isolated from these events. Its programs affect and are affected by the turmoil. *These programs cannot be responsive to the currents in American education without a means of identifying them.* Further, the Commissioner of Education serves as the spokesman in the Federal Government on issues in education. He must interpret these issues for the White House, the Congress and the Nation. He cannot operate without information. Such information is not available at the USOE. This Task Force report represents an heroic effort to collect information about the state of education in cities. This store of information will reman nadequate unless the Office begns to collect and publish such information on a regular basis.

2. *The impact of Federal dollars in cities cannot be documented—not to mention the amount.* To determine the impact of Federal efforts in urban areas, the Task Force sought data which would show the amount of money from all USOE programs being distributed to major cities. We learned that no records are maintained on this basis. The various OE programs allocate funds on a school district, county or project basis. The only common form in which the fiscal data is compiled is by congressional district. Thus OE cannot judge its policy toward urban education as reflected by the money it spends on the cities. This situation was discussed in Chapter II.

3. *The current organization of the U.S. Office of Education does not permit the function of coordinating those programs*

which affect urban areas at either the local or Federal levels. An attempt was made to coordinate OE programs at the local level through the Central Cities Project. Under the auspices of title III, ESEA, the Project attempted to impact Federal programs on inner city populations. It represented the first major attempt by local school administrators to concentrate a variety of funds in specific neighborhoods. It also brought together representatives of all the power bases in the community—parents, teachers, social service agencies, business industry—to assess needs, assign priorities, develop program strategies and evaluate results. However, its impact was limited because the Federal objectives were not clear; the feedback and data flow to OE was inadequate; Federal monitoring and technical assistance were inadequate.

Transition Into a Bureau of Urban Education

With the passage of an Urban Education Act, there should be created within the Office of Education, a Bureau of Urban Education to implement the new approach to Federal aid to urban schools embodied in the Act.

Such a Bureau should be headed by an Associate or Deputy Commissioner who reports directly to the Commissioner of Education. The budget of the Bureau of Urban Education should be submitted to the Congress as an entirely distinct line item for the scrutiny of the appropriate committees of Congress.

Functions.—The Bureau of Urban Education should perform the following functions:

Assume operating responsibility for urban-oriented programs of ESEA.

Review and determine the acceptance of State approved local plans according to specified criteria including the implementation of standards of academic performance.

Submit to Congress an annual report and recommendations on programs in effect and on functions of the Bureau.

Administer funds under the Urban Education Act. In its administration of this Act, the Bureau would be responsible for: appraising the quality and need of an urban area's education proposal for funding and assistance under priorities established either by law or administrative regulations; providing active technical assistance to the planning and implementation of urban education programs; establishing clear fiscal and programmatic review objectives and procedures of the urban education program; developing the master evaluation plan guidelines for the urban education programs and assuring that these guidelines are carried out; developing a research area within the center which develops and checks research operation *within* the overall planning and operation of the program; and enforcing the grant performance conditions through a successive series of actions when deficiencies are manifested.

Monitor other OE funds now directed to urban areas and assist in their phasing into the Master Plan for Urban Education provided by the new Act.

A minority viewpoint within the Task Force held that the group did not have sufficient information and insight on the affairs of the Office of Education to make recommendations affecting internal Office organization.

Chapter X—An Urban Education Act—The funding process

The Task Force recommends the below-listed principles as guidelines for establishing priorities, eligibility and facilitating mechanisms for the funding process related to an Urban Education Act. These principles, just as all of the Task Force's recommendations stem from the basic premise that we attempt to provide for the inner-city student a more than equal educational opportunity. These principles are designed to focus Federal effort on a priority basis to those places where equal educational opportunity is farthest from reality. This chapter summarizes these principles below and follows with a section containing explanation and discussion of each.

Summary of Principles

1. Education districts representing the largest eligible urban areas should receive priority in Federal funding.

2. Determination of eligibility of urban areas should be based on economic and performance criteria.

3. Each qualifying area should receive full-funds for its program and where sufficient funds are unavailable for full funding of every qualifying urban area in its particular size group, a system of competition for a fully funded grant should be developed.

4. Federal aid should be awarded on a basis that enables *maximum feasible* eligibility for participation among groups, agencies and institutions within designated urban areas.

5. Funding procedures should include a system of regulating recurrent eligibility, with grants renewed on the basis of evidence of quality student performance.

6. The legislation should permit a by-pass of State educational agencies where necessary to achieve urban priority.

7. The legislation should permit the participation of nonpublic school children in the program in ways to introduce a new child services concept for the disadvantaged.

8. Advance funding should be provided for the urban education grants.

9. There should be provision for the phasing in of existing categorical grant programs.

Explanation and Discussion of Principles

Principle: Education Districts Representing the Largest Eligible Urban Areas Should Receive Priority in Federal Funding

Consistent with its charge, the Task Force believes that the largest urban areas as a group should receive the most immediate attention and that the crisis in their schools should be attacked before we expand the Federal program to smaller, although burdened, areas.

There are a number of important reasons for this conclusion:

1. The crisis in education must not be separated from the crisis of our cities generally, and as suggested in Chapter VIII, the master plan must consider education along with those circumstances which affect education. What exists through education is an opportunity to break the cycle of poverty and separation now overcoming our major metropolitan areas. The problems of crime, welfare, unemployment and underemployment, shrinking city tax base and mass violence will not be overcome through the improvement of urban education alone, but neither will they be overcome without that improvement. If we are to work toward settling the urban crisis, we must begin to settle the urban education crisis.

2. The education systems of the cities of our nation are not now getting the attention they deserve from their respective States. As described in the chapter on the financial crisis, States are systematically favoring suburbs and rural areas over urban school systems. Federal assistance should require States to amend this practice, and should, on its own, begin to compensate the over-strained cities.

3. The entire thrust of Part One of this paper, particularly Chapter II on the Financial Crisis, demonstrated conclusively that it costs more to educate a child in the city. If we are to aim toward real equal educational opportunity, we must begin to redress the inequities of the major cities receiving not only less than their neighbors, but much less than they need to educate their children properly.

4. Nowhere is it more true than in the cities that we are becoming a nation of "two societies—one black, one white." The continuing debate of compensatory education versus integration has simmered, but not died. But as a matter of real fact, if present migration trends continue and if the practice of majority black and majority white schools continues, aggrevated by the fact that white city parents are continuing to place their children in private schools, integration will not be possible in the city. Projections by anyone's count are dismal. For instance, the study done by the National Center for Educational Statistics shows that by 1975, 31 of the 48 largest cities will have black school populations of over 33 percent, and 19 will have more blacks than whites in the schools. Integration in terms of racial balance within schools of the cities is probably not achievable in the context of these figures. Consequently, educational excellence within the cities must receive an immediate priority over integration with suburbia. To the degree that such excellence stops the flow of white school children into private schools or into the suburbs, something has been gained. To the degree that it reverses the trend (and scattered instances have succeeded in some areas of the country), much has been done toward integrating the schools.

5. As demonstrated elsewhere in this paper, the relationship of education to unemployment and underemployment is clear. To repeat briefly, an employer in the city need not even resort to discrimination to refuse to hire the blacks of our major cities, for in too many instances, the black is so ill prepared, he cannot qualify for our jobs—jobs becoming more white collar every day. And nowhere is unemployment higher but in the central cities. It is here where training is particularly important; it is here where a basic skill education must be effectively learned and learned fast if we are to reduce unemployment, reduce underemployment, reduce the welfare rolls, and the need for massive job training programs. It is here where all these are the most numerous, the most concentrated, the most costly.

6. The city in contrast to the smaller rural or suburban area has been the first to feel the pains of having alienated the parents, of having lost the confidence of the citizens and of having been helpless with the growing fear of the teachers. Federal attention must do more than bolster education programs; it must be the prod for change in a system which needs change and it must be the impetus in seeing that the big city school systems regain their lost responsiveness.

7. In Southern school districts, it has in the past been the policy to distribute funds within the system on an unequal basis—more to white schools than to the black schools. In other rural and suburban districts, this practice is minor, if it appears at all. But in the major cities, for whatever reasons—deliberate unequal distribution, or the inevitable practice of permitting teachers to teach where they wish, the cities suffer from poor internal distribution formulas. Dramatic cases have been published in Washington, D.C. and Boston. Conveniently, most school systems will not permit an intensive analysis of their internal distribution policies. But let us not delude ourselves—it exists and will persist unless direct action is taken against the practice.

8. Finally, although negative in its demeanor, one cannot ignore the argument that it is the major cities where the future of our education system is most in question. Chapters III and IV portray a dismal picture of alientation of parents, students, and teachers, as well as a frightening picture of increasing violence in our schools. Society is fearful of rewarding rioters. We should be at least as fearful of allowing the causes of rioting to persist

Some have criticized the major city ap-

proach because of the difficulties in coterminality of school district and city lines. However, this problem does not gainsay our basic principle which states that it is the school district serving the major city which should receive priority in Federal funding.[31]

10. Some have criticized the major city approach because of their confusion with the decentralization issue. Decentralized districts under the major city approach qualify, where they might not if student enrollment is used as a measure. In fact, this approach not only insures that decentralized major city school systems qualify, but promotes such a concept.

The Task Force recommends that the following plan be used to determine initial eligibility by size:

Cities with a population of over 100,000 people will be eligible to begin the program the first year (FY 71) if they meet defined criteria of educational need (as discussed in the next section). If insufficient funds are available for the entire group of qualifying cities, programs will be full funded on a competitive basis (as discussed in a subsequent section).

As the first group of qualifying cities is fully funded, the second group of cities can enter the process of qualifying for funds. This second group would include all cities with a population of over 50,000 people. The desired schedule is one which would allow this second group to enter the process the second year of the program.

As the earlier groups have been full funded, subsequent groups become eligible to qualify, by lowering the populaton levels, first to 25,000 and then as funds become available, by strata to be determined.

This schedule does not insist on funds for *only* the major cities. It does insist on funds for the major cities *first*.

A strongly held minority viewpoint within the Task Force is that the formula for eligibility should not identify cities *per se* for participation but rather employ school population of local districts and numbers of poor children within them as the eligibility factor—a procedure which would include a large number of rural Southern counties.

Principle: Determination of eligibility of urban areas should be based on economic and performance criteria

Careful understanding of this principle is essential. As recommended here, economic criteria (i.e., the evidence of poverty) is the primary qualifying factor for a city of sufficent size to qualify under the above-mentioned principle. The addition of performance criteria is designed to include those possible instances where a city does not suffer from an overburden of poverty individuals, but for some reason whose students are performing significantly lower than the norm. Such a system does not exclude those few urban areas whose educators are doing comparatively well in their efforts to learn how to teach.

Although there is a high correlation between family income and school achievement (r=.57 to .85 level), including performance criteria is also advantageous in that it provides the mechanism whereby success with the goal which all of our recommendations embody—student performance—can be measured and the needed tool to implement the fifth principle.

Other suggested criteria that contain ambiguities or tend to disable the efforts of Federal program administrators to identify program results:

1. *Concentrations of unemployed and underemployed youths and adults including dropouts.*—This standard varies greatly in accord with changes in the national and regional economies. It reflects effectiveness in employment, especially recruitment and placement practices more than it informs us of anything about educational needs. Dropouts statistics are as unreliable as reported crime statistics. In addition, non white urban dropout rates are *negatively* correlated with certain aspects of employment opportunity.

2. *Concentrations of AFDC mothers.*—This criterion would entail the use of an unrealiably variable indicator of one type of household poverty. State and local laws—and local interpretations of eligibility apart from what laws say—affect this index substantially, as do temporary shifts in employment and definitions of time periods. The index would add nothing of value to a household poverty criterion.

3. *Narcotics addiction rate.*—This rate is a function of the distributional economics of the drug trade. Transport practices, wholesale networks, and local police practices, all affect one's ability to infer anything of interest to a Federal administrator of educational aid to urban areas from this rate.

4. *Educational attainment of adults.*—This criterion is a statistic artifact of the occupational mix and level of economic growth of regional and local economies.

5. *Volatility, e.g., disturbances, number of minor and major arrests.*—The Kerner Commission report, the report of the National Commission on Violence, studies of student unrest, and studies of arrest rates, all indicate how unreliable and invalid are any assertions of prediction based upon these events.

6. *Evidence of efforts within the target area to begin construction problem-solving.*—Such evidence would be important only to decisions affecting *continuation* of Federal aid. As a basis for judging eligibility, it would invoke case-making, special pleading, and lobbying.

Principle: Each Qualifying Area Should Receive Full-Funds for its Program and Where Funds are Unavailable for Full-Fundings of Every Qualifying Urban Area in its Particular Size Group a System of Competition for a Full Funded Grant Should be Developed

This concept has political hazards but nevertheless is essential to achieving effective results.

1. The lessons described in Chapters VI and VII on the precedents for Federal involvement are clear. The money has done little but stimulate some "laboratory" research. Money spread too thin has little or no effect. The question simply comes down to this: If we want to solve the crisis of education in our cities we must commit to that endeavor enough funds in those chosen areas to do so. To spread even an enormous amount of funds to all the education agencies in the country will do little to solve the problem anywhere. It is futile to only reduce class size or to only increase lunch programs or to only build more buildings or to provide enough books and tools. It is a waste to do any *one* of these. What must be done is *all* of these and more as this report amply points out—and that costs money. The price tag cannot be eliminated if comprehensive planning is to be effective. For every time we don't provide enough funds *everyone* will suffer. And if cities begin with a "revised" system in one part of town and not another the trouble asked for is well deserved.

2. The Federal effort, as has been pointed out, is roughly 7 percent of the total budget of a school system. Even if we were to double that percent overnight, 86 percent of the funds would still be State and local. The significance of that percentage lies in the role of the Federal funds—impetus for change; not change itself. This paper outlines the need for major overhaul of current educational structures. The Federal government cannot do it alone, but by full funding, offering the local government a chance to succeed in its efforts of change, the Federal government can bring about the changes desired. Less than full funding will do little to shake the fortress.

3. Surprisingly to some, this concept is not without Federal precedent. The Consumer Credit Corporation insures price stability for farmers at a full funding vessel. What is necessary to insure stable prices is available and without annual national debts. The mechanism is technical; the result is not.

The defense budget is fully funded. It was not until this year, after a long historical draught, that Congress thought to question the requests of the military. And even if Congress refuses to appropriate funds for certain programs, they will not be refusing to provide the full amounts of funds necessary to keep our military manpower strength and its strategic forces up to the level necessary for a secure nation. The proposal made in this chapter provides such a mechanism for refusing a "program" while fully funding the effort. Recurrent eligibility based on student performance will provide a mechanism to prevent waste and misuse of funds in one place or another, while not in any way jeopardizing the full funding of programs elsewhere.

The highway program has been fully funded.

Principle: Federal Aid Should Be Awarded on a Basis That Enables Maximum Feasible Eligibility for Participation Among Groups, Agencies, and Institutions Within Designated Urban Areas

While the local agencies will be thoroughly involved in the process of experimenting with new educational systems and learning techniques, it would be a mistake to shift all the initiative for designing research and experimental projects to the traditional local educational agencies. A national research effort in urban education is desperately needed and centrally-stimulated initiative is vital to this process.

The Task Force therefore recommends that a percentage (5–5%) of the funds under the new urban education act be set aside for use by the Commissioner to fund groups other than the regular school authorities which design viable specific experiments for use in the inner city or other depressed areas in the metropolitan area.

In particular, urban education funds for design and experimentation should aim at having at least one major project in each city. This could include the use of "vouchers" in low income areas for parental choices of public or other schools; experiments for "parallel or alternative" schools run by nonpublic agencies, university run demonstration schools, regional schools, and the like. Urban education funds should also be used to develop models based on successful projects like the Parkway School in Philadelphia or New York's Street Academies for possible adaptation in other cities.

Principle: Funding Procedures Should Include a System of Regulating Recurrent Eligibility With Grants Renewed on the Basis of Evidence of Quality Student Performance

By way of illustrations, Title I of ESEA operates on the condition of closed eligibility. Only local education agencies (and State education agencies as the mediating bodies) may apply for Title I funds and, in turn, agree to performance evaluation, but these do not affect Federal decisions about subsequent funding. Title I establishes the essential precedent for performance evaluation. The addition of the feature of open eligibility would require the establishment of decision review.

A grant recipient should demonstrate quality performance in affecting positively the academic achievement of urban students; or the affective, health, or social development of urban students; or one of all of those areas

---

Footnotes at end of article.

identified as a special need of urban minority children and youth. Lack of evidence of impact, evidence of poor impact, or evidence of performance failure, should result in elimination from the roster of eligible agencies and groups or provide guarantee of intended change in procedures for the purposes of obtaining the above.

Where support is aimed at the strengthening of staff or facilities, the same performance criterion should pertain. Grant recipients should be obligated to demonstrate *how* the use of Federal funds for institutional purposes had positive effects upon one of the priority areas.

Indirect approaches may be more strategic than direct approaches. Therefore, evaluation should not be limited to twelve month periods. Instead, even the most indirect approach—e.g., the capitalization of new plant or equipment—must be linked systematically with the programmatic objective of the applicant, and this objective should fall within the broad areas of priority.

For example, three years of evaluation research on the More Effective Schools Program in New York City have indicated, *not* that MES is a failure but that it constitutes an incomplete program. It helps create working conditions that facilitate good teaching and helps to improve school-community relations, for instance, but it does not add its resources directly at the modification of teacher behavior and the strengthening of student learning.

The regulatory principle embodies the concept of accountability for outcomes. *It must not be applied rigidly, in the language of legislation or in the process of administration, however.* When the cost-benefit model is applied too narrowly to educational programming, a sensible sequence of operations is undermined; a system already fraught with uncertainties is damaged further. A mechanical approach to insuring accountability; within local education agencies often generates bad teaching practices in an emphasis upon mean reading scores, cramming for test-taking, and rituals of drill toward rote learning.

In spite of this grave danger, continuing eligibility should rest on evidence of performance in the areas cited and *not* on evidence of efforts at "institutional" change where unrelated to increased performance. The discontinuity between teacher preparation and learning outcomes is firmly enough documented to confirm this point.

The agencies and groups that *remain* eligible for Federal support under an urban aid act should be those that provide independently assessed, objective evidence of *incremental* gains in pupil achievement, social growth, or the enchancement of pupil interests and aspirations. This "hard line" regulatory criterion should be applied on a patient, long-term basis in order to prevent shallow programming.

Principle: The legislation should permit a by-pass of State educational agencies, where necessary

Because of the urgency of meeting critical educational needs in urban areas it is essential that the legislation contain provisions that will permit the Federal Government to deal directly with major urban areas, in the event State educational agencies are unable to provide sufficient guarantees to the Federal Government that they will perform effectively in this role. Such a provision in the law in all probability would be sufficient in itself to compel State educational agencies to meet such tests as might be established by the Federal office in requiring adequate priorities to urban educational needs and full cooperation of State educational agencies in the process of approving applications and funding projects. Therefore, in order to give the U.S. Commissioner of Education maximum negotiating powers with State educational agencies, it is recommended that the legislation permit the Commissioner to by-pass State educational agencies which fail to provide sufficient guarantees of their efficiency and willingness to perform in the capacity of advocates for renewal of urban education programs. States which have both strong departments of education, and large urban populations, should be capable of giving final approval to the content of local plans (e.g. the treatment of priorities, the quality of program, the standards of performance) as meeting Federal program and fiscal requirements. However, the Commissioner of Education should have the discretion of deciding when States have provided and demonstrated guarantees of conformance with these requirements.

Principle: The Legislation Should Permit the Participation of Non-Public School Children in the Program Designed in Ways To Introduce a New Child Services Concept for the Disadvantaged

Non-public school participation should be designed to permit benefits to children in terms of direct services, programs, equipment, and necessary staff increments to such schools. It should be possible to directly fund non-public school agencies for carrying out educational services which do not infringe on the church-State prohibitions of the first amendment. Such agencies could be made eligible for participation in the program on the basis of their guarantees to represent in their student body the ethnic and socio-economic composition of the inner-city population.

Principle: Advance Funding Should Be Provided for the Urban Education Grants

By far the most negative provision in current education funding legislation is that of current fiscal year funding arrangements which deny adequate time to plan and implement programs. Advance funding authority for the education grants is imperative and, if possible, the appropriation authority should include provision for two-year availability for the education grants as opposed to the traditional one-year availability of other educational grant funds.

Principle: There Should Be Provision for the Phasing In of Existing Categorical Grant Programs

As a funding principle the Task Force recommends that the existing programs (ESEA, VE, NDEA, EPDA) be phased into the new existing urban educational grants on a planned basis. Initially, these should be regarded as integral components of the basic urban educational master plan. After a transition period (of perhaps two years) these categorical grant programs should be phased out of the urban educational plan as specific and legal categorical components and their funds and authority merged into the new urban concept. This will permit flexibility in the administration of funds and avoid other administrative trivia in the process of adequately funding urban educational needs. It should also facilitate stronger programming and evaluation and permit new concepts to take hold more rapidly. The phasing out period could cover a one- or two-year period depending on the acceleration of urban education funding provisions.

Chapter XI—An Urban Education Act—The cost

As Chapter II of this report demonstrated, the large cities of the nation are in desperate need of financial help to compensate for the speical educational problems and the heavy non-educational costs they must bear. They are unable to meet these costs as well as unable to provide a quality education to urban youngsters with the resources currently available.

The Task Force has developed a suggested financial mechanism through which to channel increased educational resources into the cities, utilizing criteria that are described in this chapter. To explain this mechanism, the chapter is presented in the following sections: 1) the mechanism for providing aid; 2) the criteria utilized in developing the mechanism; 3) rationale for massive funding to the cities; 4) the need for guidelines; 5) summary of recommendations.

The Mechanism for Providing Aid

The Task Force submits that the mechanism that best meets urban educational needs is a formula that will provide an addition of at least a third in educational *resources:* equipment, teachers, counselors, curriculum planning, etc. We estimate that in terms of an increment to current local educational *expenditures,* a one-third addition to resources will require at least a *fifty percent addition to current local educational expenditures* due to the operation of supply and demand. We believe that such an increment in city school resources would make possible an educational program approaching that available in the best of the surrounding suburban districts. Such a program will not be cheap. We estimate that for the 10,500 school children in cities over 100,000 population the operational cost alone would fall between $5–6 billion.

The Criteria Utilized in Developing the Mechanism

In developing the financial mechanism to channel more educational resources into the cities stated above, the following criteria were utilized:

1. Urban educational aid must be additive. It should not permit reduction of state-local effort nor should it simply function to bid up educational costs.

2. Urban education aid should reflect the degree of state-local effort.

It must recognize communities that are taxing themselves the most.

3. Urban education aid systems should provide opportunity for local innovation. Imaginative and varied approaches to education should be encouraged.

4. Urban education aid should be designed to improve total city school systems. Emphasis should be placed on the special educational problem of the city: the education of the socially, economically, and educationally disadvantaged; but this emphasis should not exclude improvements in education for the entire range of students represented in large city school districts.

Rationale for Massive Funding to the Cities

It is our view, that expenditures of at least the above-described magnitude are essential if significant improvements are to be made in urban education. Marginal changes are not enough as one noted study recently concluded.

"An incremental reduction in class size from 32 to 30 does not produce measurably significant gains in output, even as an increase in materials and supplies per pupil from $7.00 to $9.00 will produce no measurably significant gains in output. But these findings tell us nothing about outcomes over a larger range of variation. A reduction in class size from 30 to 10 may produce extremely significant gains. We will never know until we try." (Burkhead, et al., 1967.)

A look at the disparity between selected central cities and their most favored suburbs gives an indication of the current range of disparity (See Table 1). The new urban education aid program we are proposing would permit, we believe, a reduction in class size by an average of 4 to 10 students per class, a number equal to the difference in most metropolitan areas between the best suburban systems and their central cities.

While reduction of class size across a whole system is a useful measure of comparative educational resources, the aid system is not intended to bring about that reduction as an end in itself. Because the sys-

tem must provide full scope for the operation of educational innovation, school systems would be permitted to use the funds to provide for concentrated remedial work in small groups of perhaps only three or four students where that seemed most appropriate, and to provide television or other technologically advanced instructional mechanisms to groups of 150 or 200 students where they were educationally more appropriate. But the use of class size as an overall measure provides a criterion that is readily available, responsive to change, and indicative of a wide range of educational benefits.

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF SELECTED CENTRAL CITIES AND SUBURBS, 1967

City and suburb	Fall 1967 enrollment	Pupil-teacher ratio	Per pupil (ADM) expenditures
Los Angeles	645,059	27	$601
Beverly Hills		17	$1,19
San Francisco	95,014	26	693
Palo Alto		21	984
Chicago	572,026	28	571
Evanston		18	757
Detroit	296,089	31	530
Grosse Pointe		22	713
St. Louis City	116,789	30	525
University City		22	747
New York City	1,106,664	20	854
Great Neck		16	1,391
Cleveland	153,350	28	559
Cleveland Heights		22	703
Philadelphia	288,055	27	617
Lower Merion		20	733

Source: Kahn, Gerald and Hughes, Warren A., Statistics of Local Public School Systems, 1967, National Center for Educational Statistics, USOE.

The Need for Guidelines

In order to assure that the new aid system accomplishes better education and not simply more expensive education, guidelines must be developed and enforced to assure that improvements take place. The use of the criteria already mentioned, a reduction in overall class size, is one available measure. Others may be developed in terms of (1) new equipment that the system has acquired, (2) the provision of remedial or specialized personnel in greater numbers than were previously available in the schools, and (3) by measure of student academic and social performance. But the guidelines that are developed, while assuring that aid results in improved educational resources, must avoid the pitfalls of overall rigid categories which stifle experimentation and change. Particularly in the areas of urban education, new and imaginative approaches to education are essential. The proposed urban aid system would also reflect state-local effort in supporting education by being calculated as a proportion of current educational expenditures, less current Federal aid. Thus the more a school district raises through local taxation and state aid, the higher is its Federal allocation. This is an important aspect of the proposed system, because it assures that new Federal funds cannot become an excuse for lessened state-local efforts.

The purposes for which the new urban aid can be used should impact upon the total city educational system. Emphasis should be placed on the education of the disadvantaged, but that emphasis should not be made to the exclusion of the full range of city educational efforts. If cities are to stem the movement to the suburbs and the flight to private education of middle income residents urban education must do more than equal education in the suburbs.

Summary of Recommendations

We are proposing, then, that a new aid to urban education program be developed to increase urban educational resources by approximately one third. To offset higher costs that would accrue through the bidding up of scarce resources, the formula for aid distribution would provide cities with an amount equal to one half of their total instructional costs, less the amount of their current Federal aid from existing programs. The decision to focus on cities is not meant to suggest that certain relatively poor and urbanized suburbs do not need similar assistance. Our recommendation is, however, that at a time when funds for domestic programs are limited, first priority be given to central cities, the areas where the needs are most pressing.

Costs of the program would depend upon the number of cities included in the program, and the scope of the assistance (e.g., whether facilities and training costs would be added to operational costs). The following summary of first year (1971–72) and full year (1974–75) costs is presented in the following:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years 1971–72	Fiscal year 1975
Group I, 100,000+:		
(a) Planning grants	62.8	
(b) Development grants	407.4	
(c) Operational grants		5,820.0
(d) Facilities (25 percent of (c))		1,455.0
(e) Training (5 percent of (c))		291.0
Total	470.2	7,566.0
Group II, 50,000+:		
(a) Planning grants	16.7	
(b) Development grants	165.4	
(c) Operational grants		2,790.0
(d) Facilities		697.5
(e) Training		139.5
Total	182.1	3,627.0
Group III, 25,000+:		
(a) Planning grants	18.2	
(b) Development grants	36.4	
(c) Operational grants		2,548.0
(d) Facilities		637.0
(e) Training		127.4
Total	54.6	3,348.8
Grand total	706.9	14,541.8

PROJECTION OF APPROPRIATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER PROPOSED URBAN EDUCATION ACT (OPERATIONAL GRANTS BASED ON $500 AND $300 PER CHILD)

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Medium		High		High 20 percent		Task force		
	Amount	Number of cities	Amount	Number of cities	Amount	Number of cities	Amount		Number of cities
1971–72									
Group I, cities over 100,000:									
Planning grants	$48.9		$62.8		$62.8		$62.8		
Development grants	311.1		407.4		407.4		407.4		
Operational grants									
Facilities at 25 percent									
Educational training at 5 percent									
Total	360.0	98	470.2	129	470.2	129	470.2		129
Group II, cities 50,000 to 100,000:									
Planning grants	0		2.9		11.7		16.7		
Development grants	0		26.9		118.1		165.4		
Operational grants	0								
Facilities	0								
Educational training	0								
Total			29.8	30	129.8	133	182.1		186
Group III, cities 25,000 to 50,000:									
Planning grants	0		0		0		18.2		
Development grants	0		0		0		36.4		
Operational grants	0		0		0				
Facilities	0		0		0				
Educational training	0		0		0				
Total							54.6		364
Total	360.0		500.0		600.0		706.9		
1975							At $500	At $300	
Group I, cities over 100,000:									
Planning grants									
Development grants									
Operational grants	1,164.6		1,764.0		2,123.0		5,820.0	3,492.0	
Facilities at 25 percent	285.0		444.0		533.0		1,455.0	873.0	
Educational training at 5 percent	50.4		92.0		104.0		291.0	174.6	
Total	1,500.0	26	2,300.0	39	2,760.0	47	7,566.0	4,539.6	129

PROJECTION OF APPROPRIATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER PROPOSED URBAN EDUCATION ACT (OPERATIONAL GRANTS BASED ON $500 AND $300 PER CHILD)—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Medium		High		High 20 percent		Task force		
	Amount	Number of cities	Amount	Number of cities	Amount	Number of cities	Amount AT $500	Amount AT $300	Number of cities
Group II, cities 50,000 to 100,000:									
Planning grants	0		0		0				
Development grants	0		0		0				
Operational grants	0		0		0		$2,790.0	$1,674.0	
Facilities	0		0		0		697.5	418.5	
Educational training	0		0		0		139.5	83.7	
Total							3,627.0	2,176.2	186
Group III, cities 25,000 to 50,000:									
Planning grants	0		0		0				
Development grants	0		0		0		36.4		
Operational grants	0		0		0		2,548/0	1,528.8	
Facilities	0		0		0		637.0	382.2	
Educational training	0		0		0		127.4	76.4	
Total							3,348.8	1,987.4	364
Total	$1,500.0		$2,300.0		$2,760.0		14,541.8	8,703.2	

The Task Force recognizes that the proposed program must be implemented in stages. Therefore, it is recommended that eligible areas receive first, planning grants to formulate specific program proposals and components and second development grants with which to initiate the program on a limited scale (e.g., a sub-system as a demonstration project) prior to full implementation of the program.

Also, in recognition of the additional and special costs of facilities needed to carry on expanded activity, the Task Force proposes an add-on cost estimated at 20 percent of operational costs as the sum needed to cover the acquisition of space. Likewise, the additional cost of training professional and non-professional staff in new roles is acknowledged with a 5 percent increment to the operational cost estimate. These incremental cost factors may be regarded as optional costs to be included or excluded based on the fiscal resources which may be assigned to the priority of urban education.

There is an irony in expressing educational improvement in dollar terms alone. Surely no product could be more intangible, more a matter of the mind and the spirit, qualities not easily translated into money values. Yet as one distinguished educator has said:

"It may be argued that simply more resources will not solve the education problems. . . . There is much uncertainty about how educational disadvantage can be overcome. One thing, however, is clear. It cannot be done cheaply. . . . To substitute educational experimentation and innovation for increased resources is to sentence those experiments and innovations to failure" (Campbell, 1968, p. 13).

The proposed program for urban education aid is designed to provide the resources to make education in the cities of the nation at least equal and hopefully, superior to education anywhere in the land.

Minority Viewpoint

A minority viewpoint presented by one member of the Task Force recommends that supplemental Federal funding of all elementary and secondary education, in all classes of school districts at the annual level of $30 billion on a formula basis which recognizes a new Federal obligation to serve the general needs of the schools to improve education for all children.

Backup Statement to the Budget Plans

1. The schedule for budget outlays follows the concept: That funds for planning and development be allocated for a two year period to implement a phasing-in of the developmental stage as soon as possible without the necessity of an additional Congressional appropriation. The two-year figure shown does *not* include funds to be allocated for operation of the programs for those LEAs ready to implement the program in the second year.

2. The column entitled Task Force figures represents those current estimates of the Task Force of what is needed to attack the urban education program in a way which promises some level of success. The Task Force felt that any less than the demonstrated figures would be wasteful and ineffectual.

3. In the column to the right of the amounts shown on the budget chart is a figure for the number of cities which should be able to qualify as we move from one level to the next. The point simply: The more money; the more cities. (A mathematical average was used for the number of cities within each size group which would receive funds, although in reality, different size cities will be receiving different amounts of money. The number of cities in each group, therefore, represents an estimate.)

4. Operational grants have been computed on both a $300 and a $500 per child basis. The $300 figure is modeled on the California standard and represents our estimation of the absolute minimum allotment for an adequate program. The Task Force recommends $500 as the figure which will begin to make a major impact on meeting the needs of the impoverished urban student.

Chapter XII. Short term recommendations for urban education

Our major recommendations are long term in nature which, if adopted, will entail the drafting of new legislation and the setting up of new administrative structures. It is expected that the recommendations will call for a several-year period of planning and development if they are to be effectively implemented.

However, we believe that there is a need for *immediate action* in the field of urban education. Therefore, we recommend that the following short term measures, based on existing legislation and programs, be implemented during the next fiscal year or two to help resolve the crisis in urban education. Many of the short term recommendations do not require Congressional action, but rather, could be initiated immediately through administrative decisions.

ESEA, Title I

1. We stand firmly behind ESEA Title I as the only Federal aid program currently providing any sizeable number of dollars for the education of disadvantaged children. We believe that ESEA, Title I must be funded at or near full authorization before any reasonable test can be made of the efficacy of compensatory education.

2. In addition to increased funding, we offer the following proposals for the improvement of ESEA, Title I:

(a) Provide states with more flexibility in making allocations within states and counties in order to concentrate Title I funds in areas with high proportions of seriously disadvantaged pupils. OE should support the Murphy amendment of S. *2218* which provides extra funds for districts, both urban and rural, with large numbers of poor children. Other steps should be taken to concentrate Title I funds, more effectively, such as, (1) increase the minimum number and percent of disadvantaged children required for LEA eligibility; (2) propose an amendment (or a change in regulation) which gives fund priority to schools based on proportion of low income population; (3) strengthen Federal guidelines requiring concentration of funds within local school districts (based on subsystems, etc.) and *monitor* their administration by the states. In addition, states, could use various indices for the disadvantaged population—poverty level, density, etc.—as the basis for special concentrated programs in central cities, allowing State governments the power to withhold some of their Title I funds for this purpose might encourage some states to act in this way.

(b) We note the persistent complaints of local and State officials about the uncertainties of Federal program funding and the loss in program quality that arises from "stop and go" programming signals. Localities object to required annual proposals and evaluations which are unrealistic in time horizon and ritualistic process. Multi-year objectives, proposals, grants and evaluations within categorical aid programs might make more sense. Advance appropriations are a prerequisite for intelligent use of the money.

(c) The legislation (ESEA, Title I) should be altered to include a by-pass for the Federal government to directly aid non-public schools should States fail to meet their responsibility in this area, and to make non-LEA's eligible for funds where districts fail to accept Federal requirements for racial desegregation.

(d) The HEW Audit Agency conducts regular assesments on a sampling basis of local and State administration of ESEA, Title 1. These audits should be placed on a current basis and should become public documents for local consumption as a means of policing the integrity of local officials.

Vocational Education

1. The administration and the Congress should adequately fund all parts of P.L. 90–576, "The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968," to increase opportunities for occupational training in urban areas.

2. The Commissioner should use his discretionary powers under Part C—Research and Training, Part D—Exemplary Programs, and Part I—Curriculum Development to concentrate funds on programs to aid the

urban disadvantaged. The Task Force recommends that such programs try new approaches to vocational and technical training such as "new careers," which train people who do not necessarily have a high school diploma for human service and public services occupations; open admissions policy at post secondary schools which would allow young people without a high school diploma to begin vocational training; imaginative programs for the disadvantaged run cooperatively by industry and the public schools; strengthened vocational guidance and placement; and the articulation of vocational and tecnical education into the general curriculum.

Expanded Research and Demonstration

1. We support the recommendation of the HEW Research Subcommittee that top priority be given to educational needs of disadvantaged elementary and secondary students, particularly in the areas of reading and math. We would expand this by recommending that Congress set aside additional funds for basic educational research, laboratory testing, and controlled experiments in the field of the disadvantaged. We also recommend that the Office of Planning and Evaluation and the Bureau of Research adopt as their chief responsibility the development of more effective research, experimentation, and program evaluation in the field of education of the disadvantaged. This would include the testing of such new approaches and decentralization and community control; new careers at the high school level, whereby youngsters of high school age are employed as teacher aides, welfare aides, police assistants, etc.; and the effect of ethnic studies on student performance.

2. The results of research must be developed and disseminated in a useful way; for example, in the form of models which might be tried in classrooms across the nation. We urge that the new R&D office in OE disseminate more information on research and evaluation of programs for the disadvantaged and that other services and models for disseminating information about the disadvantaged be developed and tried.

3. The regional education laboratories and the research and development centers should be given a much clearer mandate to serve the needs of disadvantaged students in their areas of program or geographic concern. Where possible, the labs should be linked to supplementary education centers under ESEA, Title III, to programs under Title I, and most importantly to teacher training institutes and local training programs.

4. There should be more of an effort to involve a wider range of people and abilities in the entire research program including particularly school administrators, principals, teachers, parents and specialists in the field of education of the disadvantaged. A new participating role for the consumer of educational services should be a special concern of research administrators.

Training Opportunities

1. There should be more of an effort to bring new people into the field of education including low-income persons from ethnic minorities, returning veterans, and young people from ghetto neighborhoods. In order to promote this concept, institutes for national leadership development related to the education of the disadvantaged should be established and given wide visibility. These institutes would train low-income people and veterans who have shown evidence of leadership for positions such as community liaison workers in the school system. The Head Start Supplementary Training Programs might serve as models for the leadership institutes.

2. The Teacher Corps currently enrolls approximtaely 2200 interns and 453 team leaders in an effort to recruit new personnel in poverty area schools and institutions. Two-thirds of Corps members are participating to increase the number of interns in inner city schools in urban poverty programs. The Task Force urges that the Teacher Corps and its newest model—the Urban Teacher Corps—be expanded. The Urban Teacher Corps is currently operating in several large cities including Washington, Chicago, and Pittsburgh. Under the Urban Program, the LEA assumes more of the cost of training new interns, thereby increasing their numbers and the number of schools which have interns. The Urban Teacher Corps could have a real impact on schools in large city school districts.

3. The Commissioner should use all the power at his discretion to urge States to change their certification and civil service standards to help facilitate the above proposals.

Higher Education

1. The Task Force supports fuller funding and expansion of current programs which provide assistance to qualified but needy young people who want to pursue a college education. These include Upward Bound, Special Services, Talent Search, and the financial aid programs—Equal Opportunity grants, work-study, NDEA loans, all of which are presently funded far below present level of need.

2. We support the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders that, in order to compensate for the poor level of secondary education received by ghetto youth, funds be made available for a one-year college prepartory programs for disadvantaged youth. Such programs would be operated by community colleges or LEAs.

Discretionary Funds

The Commissioner should use his discretionary powers under the various Office of Education programs to aid the disadvantaged in urban areas. Programs such as Impacted Aid and others (higher education construction, libraries, and traditional vocational programs) should be reoriented to more directly affect the lives of the disadvantaged. New monies which may be allocated for these programs should be set aside for seed capital for planning and instituting urban education programs. New programs such as the Bilingual and Dropout Prevention Titles should be assigned specific mandates for program quality development.

Financial Aid to Urban Districts

One of the key statistics upon which Federal policy is built is the aggregate Federal aid to each local educational agency. To date, there is no one source which could tell us the total amount and the breakdown of Federal funds going to urban school districts. We therefore urge that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education annually collect, prepare, and publish data on the flow of Federal funds to the central city school districts in each of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

National Commission

We firmly recommend that the administration propose that the Congress establish a "National Commission on the Future Financing of American Education," which would have a broad charter to look at every conceivable type of revenue-producing device from traditional Treasury grants-in-aid to the exotic and the visionary. For example, the Commission and its professional staff should look at the experience of other countries and some of our States which have obtained educational funds through lotteries and other types of voluntary public service contributions. Such a Commission should also have a charter broad enough to study and recommend changes in State and local taxation policy.

National Advisory Council

In appointing the new members of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged ChHdren we strongly recommend that the administration give greater weight to the inclusion of poor people directly on the Council and that the Council be given a clear mandate to look at *all* Federal programs in this area . . . not Title I alone.

Rural Areas

The Task Force assignment was to examine the needs and recommend programs designed to serve the priority of urban areas. We believe those needs to be different from and to deserve consideration over the needs of rural areas in view of population migration and other pressures affecting urban areas. However, it is abundantly clear that rural poverty is a significant problem which deserves comparable examination to urban areas. It is also our conclusion that the needs of the two areas contain important differences that deserve distinctive treatment.

FOOTNOTES

[1] National Education Association, Research Division. *Estimates of School Statistics, 1968–69.* Research Report 1968–R16. Washington, D.C. The Association, 1968.

[2] Note on Terminology: The terms *Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Metropolitan Areas,* and *SMSA's* are used interchangeably to refer to areas defined by the Census Bureau as having (1) at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants and (2) the contiguous counties that are socially and economically integrated with the central cities. *Central cities* refers, of course, to the core cities of SMSA's. The *OCC, outlying areas,* and *suburbs* are used to refer to the areas outside the central cities but within SMSA's. For a more precise and detailed explanation, see 1960 Census of Population definitions.

[3] See Alan K. Campbell "Socioeconomic and Governmental Characteristics related to Education." In R. J. Havighurst-*Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education.* 67th Yearbook of the NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1968 pp. 25–27. See also *Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics Series* p. 20, No. 181 April 21, 1969, Bureau of the Census USGPO. A recent projection of the racial composition of central cities and their suburban rings anticipates that non-white population will reach 30.7% in central cities and 6.1% in the suburbs by 1985. See *The Challenge of American's Metropolitan Population Outlook*—1960 to 1985. Prepared for the National Commission on Urban Problems by P. L. Hodge and P. M. Hauser, Washington: USGPO, 1968 pp. 25–31, esp. Table III–7 p. 31. Despite these figures, the increase in absolute numbers of non-whites in OCC areas will probably bring about a greater concern with the relationship of race and disadvantage to education there, particularly in those suburbs which are having a much higher black growth rate than the national norm.

[4] Bureau of the Census, *Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas,* p–23, No. 27, Feb. 7, 1969, p. 39.

[5] Ibid. p. 42.

[6] U.S. Department of Commerce. *1967 Census of Governments,* Vol. 4. *Finances of School Districts,* Table I, p. 9.

[7] OE staff telephoned superintendents' offices of ten large city school systems and those of outlying suburbs and requested approximate per pupil expenditures. Figures for six were conveyed by telephone.

[8] See Sacks, *Educational Finance in Large Cities,* forthcoming from Syracuse Unniversity Press, 1970, volume in the Education in Large Cities.

[9] For full dress discussions of the economic and legal aspects of inequity in State and local expenditure for education, see, for the former Charles S. Benson, *The Cheerful Prospect: A Statement on the Future of American Education,* Boston, Houghton & Mifflin, 1965; and for the legal questions, see Arthur Wise, *Rich Schools, Poor Schools.*

[10] Title I—ESEA: A Review and A Forward Look—1969. Fourth Annual Report. The National Advisory Council on the Education

of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C., 1969, p. 12.

[11] For a full discussion of many of these problems, see Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher *ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law,* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968, Chapters IV and V.

[12] A standard definition of poverty is given in conjunction with the data presented in Table 5.

[13] Chapter IV considers the problems of in- and out-migration in detail.

[14] SMSA refers to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area which is defined as a county or group of contiguous counties which include one central city or more, or "twin cities" with a combined population of at least 50,000. The title of a SMSA identifies the central city; outside central city is the balance of the SMSA. In New England, SMSA's consist of towns and cities instead of counties. *Central cities* refers, of course, to the core cities of SMSA's. The term *OCC, outlying areas,* and *suburbs* are used to refer to the areas outside the central cities but within SMSA's. For a more precise and detailed explanation, see 1960 Census of Population definitions.

[15] An unemployment rate of 6 percent for the nation is considered to be at the recession level, according to the Department of Labor.

[16] Discrepancies among figures are undoubtedly due to differences in sampling procedures, e.g., One Year Later (1969) is concerned primarily with inner city youth in the cities. These figures are concerned with the labor force in general.

[17] Material concerning the black woman's employment in relation to that of the black male was provided by the Center for Urban Education in New York City.

[18] The Department of Housing and Urban Development classifies substandard housing as that housing reported by the U.S. Bureau of Census: (1) sound but lacking full plumbing; (2) deteriorating and lacking full plumbing; or (3) dilapidated.

[19] "Moderate" incomes are above "low" incomes but are lower than "middle" incomes; as of this time, moderate incomes would be considered as ranging between $4,000 and $8,000.

[20] This table also clearly shows a point previously made concerning the numbers and percents of white and non-white women who are heads of poverty households.

[21] The extended family is one which usually includes three generations living together or it can also include aunts and uncles. Thus, the children may have more "parents" than their middle class counterparts have.

[22] Supporting data in this chapter are selective, due largely to limited preparation time. Because of such selectivity, some of the studies reported undoubtedly can be contradicted by others. Several composite studies in chart or tabular form are included which were prepared by the Center for Urban Education in New York.

[23] Data and projections in this paragraph were provided by the Center for Urban Education.

[24] These figures do not necessarily contradict those on Table 10 in Chapter 3. The latter dealt with a more specific age group and may have employed different sampling procedures, probably drawing its sample from the labor force and not from a population continuing significant numbers of dropouts.

[25] All data in the following section on personnel were provided by the Center for Urban Education unless otherwise noted.

[26] Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson, *Pygmalion in the Classroom, Teacher Expectations and Pupil Intellectual Development* (New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1968); Joe Louis Rempson, *An Exploratory Study to Help Increase the Number of Parents Who Make In-School Contacts in Low-Urban Area Public Elementary Schools,* Doctor's, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1969; Charles Edward Flowers, *Effects of Arbitrary Accelerated Group Placement on the Tested Academic Achievement of Educationally Disadvantaged Students,* Doctor's Columbia University, 1966.

[27] Data supplied by Executive Director of Pupil Personnel, Milwaukee School System.

[28] Figures supplied over the telephone by personnel from the National Center for Social Studies, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[29] Figures supplied over the telephone by personnel from the Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice and the District of Columbia Department of Corrections.

[30] Figures based on Individual Tax Returns for 1967, Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Treasury Department.

[31] In 40 of the 100 largest cities, the school district and the city are exactly coterminous. In the remaining cases, there is deviation from coterminality. Often the boundary differences are small, but sometimes they are sizeable. However, problems from these differences are those of management not of principle. As such they can be handled by administrative policy.

Appendix I. Membership of the Urban Education Task Force of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

See listing of Committee members in front of book.

Appendix II. Urban Education Task Force, History and Organization

On Mach 11, 1969, Robert H. Finch, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, announced the formation of a number of task forces to assist him in the Department's long-range planning, budgeting and legislative process. Eleven of these new task forces were in the field of education.

The Urban Education Task Force was a part of this newly-initiated planning process within the Department. Dr. Wilson C. Riles, Director of the Division of Compensatory Education for the California State Department of Education, agreed to serve as Chairman of the Task Force. His Cochairman was designated as John F. Hughes, Director of the Division of Compensatory Education, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, in the Office of Education.

This particular Task Force took on special importance because of the high priority assigned by Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., then Assistant Secretary/Commissioner of Education-designate, to finding solutions for the educational crisis in the urban areas of our Nation. By September, 1969, the Task Force was to formulate recommendations for steps that could be taken by the Administration to deal effectively with this crisis. The recommendations were to be supported by a detailed program memorandum or report, detailed budget plans, and any policy studies which the Task Force felt necessary.

To accomplish this mission, the Chairman and Co-chairman issued a call to educational leaders across the country—parents, public and private school administrators, university professors, representatives of the Federal Government, school board members and officials of concerned private organizations—to serve on the Task Force in this major undertaking. There was a very generous response from these people, as is evidenced by the membership list of the Task Force and their contributions to the work of the Task Force. At the same time, a small supportive staff of staff members from the Division of Compensatory Education and private consultants was assembled.

April 29, 1969, marked the first meeting of the Task Force membership. Held in Washington, its major initial concern was an identification of the critical problems confronting urban education and an exploration of possible solutions. The Task Force was divided into five separate committees in order to more easily deal with certain aspects of the total urban education problem. These committees and their respective chairmen were as follows:

1. Organization and Authority, Parent-Community Involvement: David Seeley, Chairman, Elinor Wolf, Co-Chairman.

2. Educational Program Components, National Assessment: Josie Bain, Chairman; Anne O. Stemmler, Co-Chairman.

3. Financial Resources; Government Relations: James A. Kelly, Chairman; Jerome T. Murphy, Co-Chairman.

4. Racial and Ethnic Isolation, Facilities, Metropolitan Planning: Harland Randolph, Chairman; Oscar Mims, Co-Chairman.

5. Educational Alternatives: Gwyn Jones-Davis, Chairman; Richard Carlson, Co-Chairman.

As a result of this April Meeting, each of the above chairman drafted a report which was circulated within the membership of the separate committees. At the same time, the Task Force staff was developing a Legislative Proposal for Urban Education Programs in response to certain legislative demands on the Secretary and Commissioner Allen which necessitated the immediate development of some tentative recommendations concerning urban education.

The five individual committee reports and the legislative proposal were the subject of discussion at the next Task Force Meeting in Washington on June 6–7. Out of this meeting, there developed five short-term legislative recommendations concerning full-funding of Title I and additions to the Title I guidelines. These were submitted to Commissioner Allen on June 9. In addition the Task Force indicated at the meeting certain directions which an urban education legislative proposal should follow. These directions are reflected in the final Task Force report.

Subsequent to the June meeting, the staff was involved in preparing the first draft of the Report. This draft was submitted as part of a July 15 interim report to the over-all Education Task Force. It was also sent to the members of the Urban Education Task Force for preliminary review prior to the last full meeting of the group which was held on July 25.

The focus of this meeting was a somewhat detailed discussion of needed additions to and revisions of the first draft. The staff was given more specific directions about some of the issues which had not as yet been settled, including the funding of educational alternatives, the involvement of nonpublic schools and the most effective role for the States to play in assisting the city schools.

A revised draft was mailed to Task Force members in September, 1969. Comments on this draft were in turn incorporated into a third draft which was then sent out for review in October, 1969. Following a survey to determine reactions of Task Force members to the report, Dr. Riles and Mr. Hughes called a meeting of Task Force Chairmen on November 21, 1969, for the purpose of discussing minority viewpoints, suggested modifications and incorporating them into the final Report. The past weeks have been spent in the final editing of the Report. Through the cooperative efforts of many people, the completed report of the Urban Education Task Force is now ready for submission to Secretary Finch and Commissioner Allen for their consideration and future action.

Appendix III. Note on Methodology for Chapter II[1]

The methodology used in this study follows the techniques developed by Brazer[2] and Campbell and Sacks[3] in making central city/outside central city comparisons. Where cities are coterminous with county boundaries or they have no overlying governments the allocation is purely mechanical; the central city and outside central city are handled as independent units. This procedure applies where the central city provides all—or nearly all—local government services (e.g., New York City, Baltimore, Boston, and Washington, D.C.), and also where there are overlying, but exactly coterminous, governments (e.g., San Francisco, Philadelphia, Denver, New Orleans and St. Louis).

Except for San Francisco, the fiscal data for the cities noted above and for their outlying areas are based entirely on published data in the *Local Government Finances in Selected Metropolitan Areas* volume and in *City Government Finances in 1964–65*, and on the comparable data for 1957.

Where there is more than one central city in a SMSA they are considered as a single unit in the central city comparisons. Thus, San Francisco is consolidated with Oakland. Oakland is not a city-county and hence calls for an allocation of county fiscal data between Oakland and the remainder of Alameda County.

In order to attribute to each central city the relevant financial items of the county in which it is located and of any other overyling local governments (mainly school districts and special districts) it was necessary to secure underlying Census survey forms and worksheet data for 1964–65. These were made available to the Commission by the Governments Division, Bureau of the Census. For 1957, such information was published in the *1957 Census of Governments*.

For those jurisdictions that are coterminous with the central city, the full financial amounts were attributed to the central city area. In the case of an overlying, but noncoterminous jurisdiction (e.g., a county) its fiscal behavior was allocated on the basis of the fraction of the total population of the overlying population residing in the central city or central cities. The residual amount was allocated to the outside central city areas. As a result the weighted averages of the central city and outside central areas are equal to the SMSA per capita figures as published for 1964–65 and as directly implied by the county area aggregates for 1957.

Generally, but not always, the allocation of fiscal responsibility involves noneducational expenditures. Occasionally there are noncoterminous school idstricts and/or districts providing higher education. The principal problems involve the allocation of county activities between the central city and outside central city areas. A comparison of tax behavior derived indirectly by this population allocation method, and directly from an analysis of tax rates indicates that our procedure does not introduce any systematic distortion into the data.

The allocation procedure may be illustrated by an example, that of San Diego. Based on published reports, the city of San Diego had general expenditures of $59,053,000 in 1964–65. It reported no expenditures for education and a nominal amount for public welfare. Education is provided by the San Diego Unified School District which reported expenditures of $70,449,000 for fiscal 1965. This amount was credited entirely to the central city area of San Diego. It was estimated that the city comprised 56.2 percent of San Diego County population; the central city area was therefore credited with $67,442,000 of the $120,003,000 of the county's general expenditure. This added up to $194,943,000, or $307 (as reported in Table A–10) for each of the 636,000 persons estimated as residing in the city of San Diego in 1964. The remaining $170,001,000 was allocated to the outside central city area of the San Diego SMSA. With an estimated population of 495,000 this equalled $343 per capita.

This was the general approach followed in the case not only of total direct general expenditures, but of educational expenditures, non-educational expenditures, taxes, and the sum of State and Federal aid.

[1] Excerpt from Appendix B, Statistical Methodology. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System*, Vol. 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities, Washington, D.C., October 1967. Pages 111–112.

[2] Harvey E. Brazer, *City Expenditures in the United States* (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1959).

[3] Alan K. Campbell and Seymour Sacks, *Mertopolitan America: Fiscal Patterns and Governmental Systems* (New York: The Free Press, 1967).

References

Baumgartner, L. Health and Ethnic Minorities in the Sixties. *American Journal of Public Health*. April 1965,

Bell, Alphonzo. Crisis in Urban Education. *Congressional Record*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Sept. 26, 1968.

Bettelheim, Bruno. Violence: A Neglected Mode of Behavior. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Philadelphia: March 1966.

Benson, Charles S. *Education Finance and Its Relation to School Opportunities on Minority Groups*. Background Study for U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1966 (unpublished).

Birch, Herbert. Health and Education of Socially Disadvantaged Children. *The Journal of Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. Oct. 1968.

Boyd, G. F. The Levels of Aspiration of White and Negro Children in a Non-Segregated Elementary School. *Journal of Social Psychology*. Nov. 1959; Rosen, Bernard C. Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome. *American Sociological Review*. Oct. 1959; Reiss, A. J. and Rhodes, A. C. Our Educational Norms and Goals of Conforming, Truant and Delinquent Adolescents Influence by Group Position in American Society. *Journal of Negro Education*. Summer 1959; Sprey, Jiste. Sex Differences in Occupational Choice Patterns Among Negro Adolescents. *Social Problems*, Summer 1962.

Brown, Claude. *Manchild in the Promised Land*. New York: The New American Library, 1966.

Burkhead, Jesse with Fox, Thomas G. and Holland, John W. *Input and Output in Large—City High Schools*. Education in Large Cities Series. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. 1967.

Bureau of the Census and the U.S. Department of Commerce. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. 1968.

Bureau of the Census and the U.S. Department of Commerce. Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–23, No. 27. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. February 1969.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. Three Standards of Living for an Urban Family of Four Persons. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor. March, 1969.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Employment Situation in Urban Poverty Neighborhoods: Fourth Quarter 1968. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Jan. 1969.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, *The Negroes in the United States, Their Economic and Social Situation*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. 1966,(c)

Campbell, Alan K. Matching Resources to Need. A paper presented at the Semi-annual Meeting of the Committee for Economic Development. Nov. 14, 1968.

Campbell, Alan K. Socio-economic and Governmental Characteristics related to Education. In R. J. Havighurst, *Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education*. 67th Yearbook of the NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Carnegie Quarterly. Where Failures Make the Grade, Fall 1968.

Clark, Kenneth. *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Cohen, Stanley M. *Politics of Vandalism*. The Nation. Nov. 11, 1968.

Coleman, James, et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Study by the National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Cravioto, J., DeLichardie, E., and Birch, H. G. Nutrition, Growth and Neuro-Integrative Development: An Experiment and Ecologic Study. *Pediatrics*. 1966, No. 38.

Densen, P. M. and Haynes, A. Research and the Major Health Problem of Negro Americans. A paper presented at the Howard University Centennial Celebration. Washington, D.C.: 1967. (unpublished).

Douglas, Joseph H. The Urban Negro Family. In John T. Davis (Ed). *The American Negro Reference Book*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Draft Report. Committee on Finance and Governmental Relations of the Urban Education Task Force. May 28, 1969.

Farmer, James, Stereotypes of the Negro and their Relationship to his Self-Image. In H. C. Rudman and R. L. Featherstone, *Urban Schooling*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. 1968.

Federal Manpower Programs, Reprint of pages 134 to 147 from Special Analyses, Budget of the United States, 1970. Washington, D.C. Bureau of the Budget, 1969.

Feuer, Lewis *The Conflict of Generations* New York: Basic Books, 1969. Bernstein, Saul. *Alternatives to Violence; Alienated Youth and Riots—Race and Poverty*. New York: Associated Press, 1967.

Froomkin, J. and Dugan, D. J. *Inequality Studies in Elementary and Secondary Education*. U.S. Office of Education. 1966.

Frost, Joe L. and Hawkes, Glenn R. *The Disadvantaged Child*. Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Gruthrie, James W. et al. *Schools and Inequality:* A Study of Social Statistics, School Services, Student Performance, and Post-School Opportunities in Michigan. Draft of July 1, 1969.

Havighurst, Robert J. Urbanization and Education in the U.S. In Harry Passow, (Ed.). *International Review of Education*. Hamburg: Unesco Institute of Education, 1967. Vol XII, No. 4.

Hentoff, Nat. *Our Children are Dying*. New York: The New Viking Press, 1966.

Hodge, P. L. and Hauser, P. M. *The Challenge of America's Metropolitan Population Outlook*—1960 to 1985. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Infant and Perinatal Mortality in the United States. Public Health Service. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office. Oct. 1965, No. 1000—Series 3 and No. 4.

Jackson, Carolyn and Welten, Terri. Residence, Race and Age of Poor Families in 1966. *Social Security Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966.

Keach, Everett T., Fulton, Robert and Gardner, William E., *Education and Social Crisis: Perspectives of Teaching Disadvantaged Youths*. New York: J. Wiley, 1967.

Keith, H. *Housing America's Low and Moderate-Income Families. Prepared for the National Commission on Urban Problems*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968. Research Report No. 8.

Kessler, Henry H. *Rehabilitation of the Physically Handicapped*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Kohl, Herbert. *Teaching the "Unteachable."* New York: The New York Review, 1967.

Local Finance. New York State Temporary Commission on the Constitutional Convention. Jan. 27, 1967.

Louria, Margot and Stokes, Marguerite C. *Profiles of Twenty Major American Cities*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Program for the Disadvantaged, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. January, 1968.

Manpower Report of the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. April, 1967.

Manpower Report of the President. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. April, 1968.

Mayerson, Charlotte L. (Ed.) *Two Blocks Apart: Juan Gonzalas and Peter Guiam*. In Mario D. Fantini and Gerald Weinstein, *The Disadvantaged Challenge to Education*. New York: Harper and Row, Inc. 1968.

Minuchin, Salvador et al. *Families of the Slums*. An Exploration of their Structure and Treatment. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1967.

Moore, Juan W. and Mittlebach, Frank G. Residential Segregation in the Urban Southwest, *Mexican-American Study Project Advance Report 4*. Los Angeles: The University of California, 1966.

Murnaghan, Francis D., and Mandel, Richard, Trends and Musts in Federal Education Legislation, # *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1969.

NEA, Research Division. *Estimates of School Statistics, 1968–69*, Research Report 1968–R16. Wash. D.C.: The Assoc., 1968.

New York Times. March 16, 1969.

New York Times. July 14, 1969.

Polski, Harry A. and Brown, Roscoe C. (editors). *The Negro Almanac*. New York: Bellwethe Publishing Co. 1967.

President Nixon's Task Force on Urban Education. *Report*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Record—House, March 12, 1969.

Riessman, Frank. *The Culturally Deprived Child*. New York: Harper & Row, Inc., 1962.

Republican Coordinating Committee. Study Group on Urban Education. Urban Education: Problems and Priorities. Washington, D.C.: Fontana Lithographers. March, 1968.

Sales Management. Survey of Buying Power. June 10, 1969, Vol. 102, No. 12.

Sacks, Seymour. *Educational Finance in Large Cities*. Forthcoming from Syracuse University Press. 1970, a volume in the Education in Large Cities Series.

Sarasan, Seymour R. *Psychological Problems in Mental Deficiency*. New York: Harper Bros., 1959.

Schaefer, Arnold E. and Johnson, Ogden C. Are We Well Fed? The Search For The Answer. *Nutrition Today*. Spring, 1969.

Schnore, Leo F. and Sharp, Harry. The Changing Color of Our Big City, In J. K. Haydden, L. H. Masotti, and C. T. Larsen. *Metropolis In Crisis*. Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1967.

Schrieber, Daniel. 700 Drop-Outs: America's Top Authority Outlines the Dimensions of a National Problem. *American Education*. June 1968.

Sizer, Theodore. Schools and the City. In James Wilson, *The Metropolitan Enigma*. Washington, D.C.: Chambers of Commerce of the United States, 1967.

Stemmler, Anne. An Experimental Approach to the Teaching of Oral Language and Reading. *Harvard Educational Review*. Cambridge: Harvard University, Winter, 1966.

Title I—ESEA: a review and a forward look—1969. Fourth Annual Report. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C.: 1969.

Urban America, Inc. and The Urban Coalition. *One Year Later: An Assessment of the Nation's Response to the Crisis Described by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. Washington, D.C.: Uuban America, Inc. and The Urban Coalition, 1969.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education *Digest of Educational Statistics*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. 1968.

U.S. Senate Hearings of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs: Nutrition and Human Needs. Statement by Wilbur J. Cohen, Former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. Jan. 1969.

U.S. Senate. Hearings of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs: Nutrition Statement by Charles Upton Lowe, Jan. 1969.

U.S. News and World Report, March 6, 1967.

Article by Robert H. Samuelson. *The Washington Post*. U.S. Study Finds 23% in D.C. "Subemployed." May 18, 1969.

ADDENDA TO REFERENCES

1. Billingsley, Andrew. Black Families in White America. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

2. It should be pointed out that the great proportion of references cited in the Report were made available by the Center for Urban Education in New York City: in Memoranda 1–10. Unpublished Material, 1969.

3. Bureau of Census and the U.S. Department of Commerce, *Population Characteristics Series* P–20, No. 181, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 21, 1969.

4. Dodson, Dan W. The Public Schools: A Sociological Perspective. A paper delivered to the 28th Annual Superintendents Work Conference, Teachers' College, Columbia University, July 8, 1969.

5. Downs, Anthony. *Who are the Urban Poor?* New York: Committee for Economic Development, October 1968.

6. U.S. Department of Commerce. 1967 Census of Governments, Vol. 4, Finances of School Districts, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

The Dissent of Francis D. Murnaghan Jr. from *The Final Report of the HEW Urban Education Task Force*

Francis D. Murnaghan Jr., former president of the Board of School Commissioners in Baltimore, released the only dissenting remarks to the majority report of the HEW Urban Education Task Force. He said his dissent "centers on the indiscriminate generalizations castigating the urban school systems of America for failure and default." The Task Force report would suggest, he charged, that "there is nothing working in the American urban schools systems." He said "this approach is inaccurate and a terrible mistake."

Murnaghan offered another reason for his dissent: "I cannot subscribe to the majority report because of its theme that, bad as the financial crisis is, other factors are more significant in explaining the inadequacies of present day urban education."

The Baltimore civic leader was particularly upset with the "low" request for new federal aid sought by the Task Force. Instead of $5 to $7 billion more, he said, it should be from $27 to $30 billion more. The report's request is "unrealistically inadequate," he declared. Murnaghan predicted that "without adequate funding, we are going to see a collapse of the present educational structure."

The Task Force made another major mistake, Murnaghan declared, when it advised the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Commissioner of Education to push for aid limited to only urban schools. "I agree that this is the greatest need in American education today," he said, but it is politically impractical. Congress would not limit funds in a big new education bill to just city schools, he said.

Murnaghan's dissent was written on Oct. 3, 1969, before the final report was completed. Its message was studied by the report's authors and several suggestions were incorporated at least partially into the final version. However, the changes were called "superficial" by Murnaghan.